Optimum Trade-offs Between the Error Exponent and the Excess-Rate Exponent of Variable-Rate Slepian-Wolf Coding

Nir Weinberger and Neri Merhav
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
Technion - Israel Institute of Technology
Technion City, Haifa 3200004, Israel
{nirwein@tx, merhav@ee}.technion.ac.il

arXiv:1401.0892v3 [cs.IT] 6 Nov 2014

Abstract

We analyze the optimal trade-off between the error exponent and the excess-rate exponent for variable-rate Slepian-Wolf codes. In particular, we first derive upper (converse) bounds on the optimal error and excess-rate exponents, and then lower (achievable) bounds, via a simple class of variable-rate codes which assign the same rate to all source blocks of the same type class. Then, using the exponent bounds, we derive bounds on the optimal rate functions, namely, the minimal rate assigned to each type class, needed in order to achieve a given target error exponent. The resulting excess-rate exponent is then evaluated. Iterative algorithms are provided for the computation of both bounds on the optimal rate functions and their excess-rate exponents. The resulting Slepian-Wolf codes bridge between the two extremes of fixed-rate coding, which has minimal error exponent and maximal excess-rate exponent, and average-rate coding, which has maximal error exponent and minimal excess-rate exponent.

Index Terms

Slepian-Wolf coding, variable-rate coding, buffer overflow, excess-rate exponent, error exponent, reliability function, random-binning, alternating minimization.

I. Introduction

The problem of distributed encoding of correlated sources has been studied extensively since the seminal paper of Slepian and Wolf [1]. That paper addresses the case, where a memoryless source $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}$ needs to be compressed by two separate encoders, one for $\{X_i\}$ and one for $\{Y_i\}$. In a nutshell, the most significant result of [1] states that if $\{Y_i\}$ is known at the decoder side, then $\{X_i\}$ can be compressed at the rate of the *conditional* entropy of $\{X_i\}$ given $\{Y_i\}$. Since this is the minimal rate even for the case where $\{Y_i\}$ is known also to the encoder, then no rate loss is incurred by the lack of knowledge of $\{Y_i\}$ at the encoder. Early research has focused on asymptotic analysis

of the decoding error probability for the ensemble of random binning codes. Gallager [2] has adapted his well known analysis techniques from random channel coding [3, Sections 5.5-5.6] to the random binning ensemble of distributed source coding. Later, it was shown in [4] and [5] that the universal *minimum entropy* decoder also achieves the same exponent. Expurgated error exponents were given in [6], assuming optimal decoding (non-universal). In [7, Appendix I], Ahlswede has shown the achievability of random binning and expurgated bounds via codebooks generated by permutations of good channel codes. The expurgated exponent analysis was then generalized to coded side information in [8] (with linear codes) and [9].

In all the above papers, fixed-rate coding was assumed, perhaps because, as is well known, Slepian-Wolf (SW) coding is, in some sense, analogous to channel coding (without feedback) [6], [7], [10], [11], for which variable-rate is usually of no use. More recently, it was recognized that variable-rate SW coding may have improved performance. For example, it was shown in [12], [13], [14] that variable-rate SW codes might have lower redundancy (additional rate beyond the conditional entropy, for a given error probability). Other results on variable-rate coding can be found in [15], [16], [17]. In another line of work, which is more relevant to this paper, it was observed that variable-rate coding under an average rate constraint [18], [19], [20] outperforms fixed-rate coding in terms of error exponents. The intuitive reason is that the empirical probability mass function (PMF) of the source tends to concentrate exponentially fast around the true PMF, and so in order to asymptotically satisfy an average rate constraint R, it is only required that the rates allocated to typical source blocks would have rate less than R (see [18, Thm. 1]). Other types, distant from the type of the source, can be assigned with arbitrary large rates, and thus effectively may be sent uncoded.

The expected value of the rate is, however, a rather soft requirement, and it provides a meaningful performance measure only in the case of many system uses, where the random rate concentrates around its expected value. Consider, for example, an on-line compression scheme, in which the codeword is buffered at the encoder before transmitted [21], [22]. If the instantaneous codeword length is larger than the buffer size, then the buffer overflows. If the decoder is aware of this event (using a dedicated feed-forward channel, e.g.) then this is an *erasure* event, and so, it is desirable to minimize this probability, while maintaining some given error probability. In a different case, the buffer length might be larger than the maximal codeword length, but the buffer is also used for other purposes (e.g., sending status data). If the data codewords have priority over all other uses, then it is desirable to minimize the occasions of blocking other usage of the buffer. This motivates us to take a somewhat different approach and address a more refined figure of merit for the rate. Specifically, we will be interested in the probability that the rate exceeds a certain threshold. While the aforementioned average-rate coding increases error exponents, its excess-rate probability is clearly inferior to that of fixed-rate coding.

It should be mentioned that in many other problems in information theory, instead of considering the average value of some cost (which for SW coding is the rate) more refined figures of merit are imposed, such as the excess probability or higher moments. Beyond lossless compression, which was mentioned above, other examples include excess distortion [23], [24], variable-rate channel coding with feedback [25], list size of a list decoder [26], and

estimation [27] (see also [28] for intimately related problem of minimizing exponential moments of a cost function, and many references therein).

In this paper, we systematically analyze the trade-off between excess-rate exponent and the error exponent. Based on the analogy of SW and channel coding, we provide upper (converse) bounds on the error and excess-rate exponents of a general SW code. Then, we derive lower (achievability) bounds via a special class of SW codes, which assign the same coding rate to all source blocks of the same type class. The bounds on error exponents may be considered as a generalization of the error exponents of [18], [19], [20] to the case where excess-rate performance is of importance. As will be seen, this requires a joint treatment of *all* possible types of the source at the same time, and not just the type of the source, as in average-rate coding. Both bounds will initially be expressed via fixed-composition reliability functions of channel codes (to be defined in the sequel), and only afterwards, specific known bounds (random coding, expurgated and sphere packing) on the reliability functions will be applied. This links the question whether assigning equal rates to source blocks of the same type class is asymptotically optimal, to the unsettled gap between the infimum and supremum reliability functions (to be also defined in the sequel) [29, Problem 10.7]. Whenever it can be verified that no gap exists, then assigning equal rates to types is optimal. However, similarly as in channel coding, above the critical rate, where the reliability function is known exactly, the upper and lower bounds of SW exponents coincide for small error exponents, and then assigning equal rates to types class is optimal. Next, for every type class, bounds on the minimal encoding rate, required to meet a prescribed value of error exponent, will be found, and corresponding bounds on the resulting excess-rate performance of the system will be derived. Since the computation of both the rate for a given type, and the excess-rate exponent, lead to optimization problems that lack closed-form solutions, we will provide explicit iterative algorithms that converge to the optimal solutions.

The outline of the remaining part of the paper is as follows. In Section II, we establish notation conventions and formulate SW codes. We also formulate channel codes and provide background of known results, which are useful for the analysis of SW codes. In Section III, we derive upper and lower bounds on the error exponent and excess-rate exponent of general SW codes, and discuss the trade-off between the two exponents. Then, in Section IV, we characterize the optimal rate allocation (in a sense that will be made precise), under an error exponent constraint, and in Section V, we analyze the resulting excess-rate exponent. In Section VI, we discuss computational aspects of the bounds on the optimal rate allocation, as well as the bounds on the optimal excess-rate exponent. Section VII demonstrates the results via a numerical example, and Section VIII summarizes the paper, along with directions for further research. Almost all proofs are deferred to Appendix A. In Appendix B, we provide several general results on the reliability function of channel coding, which are required in order to fully understand the proofs in Appendix A. In Appendix C and Appendix D, we provide some side results, and Appendix E we provide some useful Lemmas.

II. Problem Formulation

A. Notation Conventions

Throughout the paper, random variables will be denoted by capital letters, specific values they may take will be denoted by the corresponding lower case letters, and their alphabets will be denoted by calligraphic letters. Random vectors and their realizations will be denoted, respectively, by capital letters and the corresponding lower case letters, both in the bold face font. Their alphabets will be superscripted by their dimensions. For example, the random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$, ($n$ positive integer) may take a specific vector value $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in $\mathcal{X}^n$, the nth order Cartesian power of $\mathcal{X}$, which is the alphabet of each component of this vector. For any given vector $\mathbf{x}$ and set of indices $\mathcal{I} \triangleq \{i_1, \ldots, i_I\}$ we will denote $\mathbf{x}(\mathcal{I}) = (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_I})$, and for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ we will denote $\{i : j\} \triangleq \{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}$.

The source to be compressed will be denoted by the letter P, subscripted by the names of the relevant random variables/vectors and their conditionings, if applicable. We will follow the standard notation conventions, e.g., $P_X(x)$ will denote the X-marginal of P, $P_{Y|X}(y|x)$ will denote the conditional distribution of Y given X, $P_{XY}(x, y)$ will denote the joint distribution, and so on. The arguments will be omitted when we address the entire PMF, e.g., P_X, $P_{Y|X}$ and P_{XY}. Similarly, generic sources will be denoted by Q, $\tilde{Q}$, Q^*, and in other forms, again subscripted by the relevant random variables/vectors/conditionings. The joint distribution induced by a PMF Q_X and conditional PMF $Q_{Y|X}$ will be denoted by $Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}$, and its Y-marginal will be denoted by $(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X})_Y$, or simply by Q_Y when understood from context. An exceptional case will be the 'hat' notation. For this notation, $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}$ will denote the empirical distribution of a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$, i.e., the vector of relative frequencies $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(x)$ of each symbol $x \in \mathcal{X}$ in $\mathbf{x}$. The type class of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$, which will be denoted by $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})$, is the set of all vectors $\mathbf{x}'$ with $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}'} = \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}$. The set of all type classes of vectors of length n over $\mathcal{X}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, and the set of all possible types over $\mathcal{X}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \triangleq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$. Similar notation for type classes will also be used for generic types $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ will denote the set of all vectors $\mathbf{x}$ with $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}} = Q_X$. In the same manner, the empirical distribution of a pair of vectors $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ will be denoted by $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{xy}}$ and the joint type class will be denoted by $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{xy}})$. The joint type classes over the Cartesian product alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \triangleq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$. For a joint type $Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_{XY})$ will denote the set of all pair of vectors $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{xy}} = Q_{XY}$. The empirical conditional distribution induced by $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ will be denoted by $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}}$, and the conditional type class, namely, the set $\{\mathbf{x}' : \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{y}} = \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{xy}}\}$, will be denoted by $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}})$, or more generally $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_{X|Y})$ for a generic empirical conditional probability. The probability simplex for $\mathcal{X}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$, and the simplex for the alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$.

The support of a PMF Q_X will be denoted by $\mathrm{supp}(Q_X) \triangleq \{x : Q_X(x) \neq 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. For two PMFs P_X, Q_X over the same finite alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, we will denote the variation distance ($\mathcal{L}_1$ norm) by

$$||P_X - Q_X|| \triangleq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |P_X(x) - Q_X(x)|. \tag{1}$$

When optimizing a function of a distribution Q_X over the entire probability simplex $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$, the explicit display of the constraint will be omitted. For example, for a function $f(Q)$, we will write $\min_Q f(Q)$ instead of $\min_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})} f(Q)$. The same will hold for optimization of a function of a distribution Q_{XY} over the probability simplex $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})$.

The expectation operator with respect to (w.r.t.) a given distribution, e.g. Q_{XY}, will be denoted by $\mathbb{E}_{Q_{XY}}[\cdot]$ where, again, the subscript will be omitted if the underlying probability distribution is clear from the context. The entropy of a given distribution, e.g. Q_X, will be denoted by $H(Q_X)$, and the binary entropy function will be denoted by $h_B(q)$ for $0 \leq q \leq 1$. The average conditional entropy of $Q_{Y|X}$ w.r.t. Q_X will be denoted by $H(Q_{Y|X}|Q_X) \triangleq \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)H(Q_{Y|X}(\cdot|x))$, and the mutual information of a joint distribution Q_{XY} will be denoted by $I(Q_{XY})$. The information divergence between two distributions, e.g. P_{XY} and Q_{XY}, will be denoted by $D(P_{XY}||Q_{XY})$ and the average divergence between $Q_{Y|X}$ and $P_{Y|X}$ w.r.t. Q_X will be denoted by $D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \triangleq \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)D(Q_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)||P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x))$. In all the information measures above, the PMF may also be an empirical PMF, for example, $H(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})$, $D(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}||P_{Y|X})$ and so on.

We will denote the Hamming distance of two vectors $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$ and $\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{X}^n$ by $d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z})$. The length of a string b will be denoted by $|b|$, and the concatenation of the strings $b_1, b_2, \ldots$ will be denoted by $(b_1, b_2, \ldots)$. For a set $\mathcal{A}$, we will denote its complement by $\mathcal{A}^c$, its closure by $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$, its interior by $\mathrm{int}(\mathcal{A})$, and its boundary by $\partial\mathcal{A}$. If the set $\mathcal{A}$ is finite, we will denote its cardinality by $|\mathcal{A}|$. The probability of the event $\mathcal{A}$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})$, and $\mathbb{I}(A)$ will denote the indicator function of this event.

For two positive sequences, $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ the notation $a_n \doteq b_n$ will mean asymptotic equivalence in the exponential scale, that is, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log(\frac{a_n}{b_n}) = 0$. Similarly, $a_n \dot{\leq} b_n$ will mean $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log(\frac{a_n}{b_n}) \leq 0$, and so on. The function $[t]_+$ will be defined as $\max\{t, 0\}$, and $\lceil t\rceil$ will denote the ceiling function. For two integers, a, b, we denote by $a \mod b$ the modulo of a w.r.t. b. Unless otherwise stated, logarithms and exponents will be understood to be taken to the natural base.

B. Slepian-Wolf Coding

Let $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be n independent copies of a pair of random variables (X, Y). We assume that $X\in\mathcal{X}$ and $Y\in\mathcal{Y}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite alphabets, are distributed according to $P_{XY}(x, y) = \mathbb{P}(X = x, Y = y)$. It is assumed that $\mathrm{supp}(P_X) = \mathcal{X}$ and that $\mathrm{supp}(P_Y) = \mathcal{Y}$, otherwise, remove the irrelevant letters from their alphabet. We say that the conditional distribution $P_{Y|X}$ is not *noiseless* if there exists a pair of input letters $x, x'\in\mathcal{X}$ and an output letter $y\in\mathcal{Y}$ such that $P_{Y|X}(y|x)\cdot P_{Y|X}(y|x') > 0$, and assume this property for P_{XY}, and so, $H(X|Y) > 0$.

A SW code $\mathcal{S}_n$ for sequences of length n is defined by a prefix code with encoder

$$s_n : \mathcal{X}^n \to \{0, 1\}^* \tag{2}$$

and a decoder

$$\sigma_n : \{0, 1\}^* \times \mathcal{Y}^n \to \mathcal{X}^n, \tag{3}$$

where $\{0,1\}^*$ is the set of all finite length binary strings. The encoder maps a source block $\mathbf{x}$ into a binary string $s_n(\mathbf{x}) \in \{0,1\}^*$, where for $b \in \{0,1\}^*$, the inverse image of s_n is defined as

$$s_n^{-1}(b) \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : s_n(\mathbf{x}) = b\} \tag{4}$$

and it is called a *bin*. The decoder σ_n, which observes $b = s_n(\mathbf{x})$ and the side information $\mathbf{y}$, has to decide on the particular source block $\mathbf{x} \in s_n^{-1}(b)$ to obtain a decoded source block $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \triangleq \sigma_n(s_n(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})$. A sequence of SW codes $\{\mathcal{S}_n\}_{n\geq 1}$, indexed by the block length n will be denoted by $\mathcal{S}$.

The error probability, for a given code $\mathcal{S}_n = \{s_n, \sigma_n\}$, is denoted by $p_e(\mathcal{S}_n) \triangleq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X})$. The *infimum error exponent* achieved for a sequence of codes $\mathcal{S}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log p_e(\mathcal{S}_n) \tag{5}$$

and the *supremum error exponent* achieved is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq \limsup_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log p_e(\mathcal{S}_n). \tag{6}$$

While clearly, $\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}) \leq \mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S})$, it is guaranteed that $p_e(\mathcal{S}_n) \dot{\geq} \exp\left[-n\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S})\right]$ for all sufficiently large block lengths, while $p_e(\mathcal{S}_n) \doteq \exp\left[-n\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S})\right]$ may hold only for some sub-sequence of block lengths. Thus, from a practical perspective, $\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S})$ is more robust to the choice of block length.

For a given $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we define, with a slight abuse of notation, the *conditional infimum error exponent* as

$$\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}, Q_X) \triangleq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \tag{7}$$

where we use the convention that $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \triangleq 0$ if $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ is empty. $\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S}, Q_X)$ is defined analogously.

The coding rate of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is defined as $r(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{|s_n(\mathbf{x})|}{n \cdot \log_2 e}$. A SW code is termed a *fixed-rate* code of rate R_0 if $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mathsf{R}_0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$. Otherwise it is called a *variable-rate* code, and has an *average rate* $\mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{X})]$. We define the *conditional rate* of $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ as

$$\overline{R}(Q_X; \mathcal{S}) \triangleq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{X}) | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)] \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{X}) | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)] \triangleq 0$ if $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ is empty. Since $r(\mathbf{x}) = \log \mathcal{X}$ allows the encoding of $\mathbf{x}$ with zero error, it will be assumed that $\overline{R}(Q_X; \mathcal{S})$ is finite. For a given target rate R, the excess-rate probability, of a code $\mathcal{S}_n$, is denoted by $p_r(\mathcal{S}_n, \mathsf{R}) \triangleq \mathbb{P}\{r(\mathbf{X}) \geq \mathsf{R}\}$, and the *excess-rate exponent function*, achieved for a sequence of

codes $\mathcal{S}$, is defined as[1]

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S},\mathsf{R}) \triangleq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log p_r(\mathcal{S}_n,\mathsf{R}). \tag{9}$$

For a given $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we define, with a slight abuse of notation, the *conditional excess-rate exponent* as

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S},\mathsf{R},Q_X) \triangleq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X}) \geq \mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X}) \geq \mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \triangleq 0$ if $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ is empty.

In the remaining part of the paper, we will mainly be interested in the following sub-class of variable-rate SW codes.

Definition 1. A SW code $\mathcal{S}_n$ is termed *type-dependent, variable-rate* code, if $r(\mathbf{x})$ depends on $\mathbf{x}$ only via its type (empirical PMF). Namely, $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}} = \hat{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}$ implies $r(\mathbf{x}) = r(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$. Any finite function $\rho(\cdot) : \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is called a *rate function*. A rate function is termed *regular* if there exists a constant $d > 0$ and a set $\mathcal{V} \triangleq \{Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) : D(Q_X||P_X) < d\}$**,** such that $\rho(\cdot)$ is continuous in $\mathcal{V}$, and equals some constant R_0 for $Q_X \in \mathcal{V}^c$.

The main objective of the paper is to derive the optimal trade-off between the error exponent and the excess rate exponent, i.e., to find the maximal achievable excess rate exponent, under a constraint on the error exponent. The subclass of type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes will be shown to achieve the optimal trade-off in a certain range of exponents, and the question of their optimality in other ranges will be discussed.

C. Channel Coding

In SW coding, the collection of source words that belong to the same bin, can be considered a channel code, and given the bin index, the SW decoder acts just as a channel decoder (with the exception that the prior probabilities of the source blocks in the bin may not necessarily be uniform). Thus, error exponents of SW codes are intimately related to error exponents of channel codes (e.g. [6], [19]). Accordingly, we next define a few terms associated with channel codes, which will be needed in the sequel.

Consider a discrete memoryless channel $\{W(y|x),\ x\in\mathcal{X},\ y\in\mathcal{Y}\}$ with input alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ and output alphabet $\mathcal{Y}$, which are both finite. A channel code $\mathcal{C}_n$ of block length n is defined by an encoder

$$f_n : \left\{1,\ldots,\lceil e^{n\mathsf{R}}\rceil\right\} \to \mathcal{X}^n \tag{11}$$

and a decoder

$$\varphi_n : \mathcal{Y}^n \to \{1,\ldots,\lceil e^{n\mathsf{R}}\rceil\}, \tag{12}$$

[1]In the definition of achievable excess-rate exponent, we use only limit inferior. It should be observed that for an operational meaning, the error exponent and excess-rate exponent should be *jointly* approached by a sub-sequence of block lengths. When the limit inferior is used for both the definition of the error exponent and the definition of the excess-rate exponent, any sufficiently large block length will approach the asymptotic limit of both exponents. When one of the exponents is defined as limit inferior, and the other is defined as limit superior, then there exists a *sub-sequence* of block lengths with the required limits, but these block lengths may be arbitrarily distant. Finally, there is no operational meaning to defining both exponents with limit superior, since the two sub-sequences of block lengths which achieve each of the exponents might be completely disjoint.

where R is the rate of the code. We say that the channel code is a *fixed composition* code, if all codewords $\{f_n(m)\}$, $1 \leq m \leq \lceil e^{n\mathsf{R}} \rceil$, belong to a single type class $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$. A sequence of channel codes will be denoted by $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_n\}_{n\geq 1}$. The error probability for a given channel code $\mathcal{C}_n = \{f_n, \varphi_n\}$ is denoted by $p_e(\mathcal{C}_n) \triangleq \mathbb{P}(\varphi_n(f_n(M)) \neq M)$, where M is a uniform random variable over the set $\left\{1, \ldots, \lceil e^{n\mathsf{R}} \rceil\right\}$. The infimum error exponent, achieved for a given sequence of channel codes $\mathcal{C}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_c^-(\mathcal{C}) \triangleq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}_n) \tag{13}$$

and the supremum error exponent is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_c^+(\mathcal{C}) \triangleq \limsup_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}_n). \tag{14}$$

A number $\mathsf{E}_e > 0$ is an achievable infimum (supremum) error exponent for the type $Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$ and the channel W at rate R, if for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a sequence of types $Q_X^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ such that $Q_X^{(n)} \to Q_X$ and there exists a sequence of fixed composition channel codes $\mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^{(n)})$ with

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_n|}{n} \geq \mathsf{R} - \delta \tag{15}$$

and $\mathcal{E}_c^-(\mathcal{C}) \geq \mathsf{E}_e - \delta$ (respectively, $\mathcal{E}_c^+(\mathcal{C}) \geq \mathsf{E}_e - \delta$). For a given rate R, a type Q_X, and the channel W, we let $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ ($\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$) be the largest achievable infimum (respectively, supremum) error exponent over all possible sequences of codes $\mathcal{C}$ for the type Q_X. The functions $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ may be interpreted as *infimum/supremum fixed-composition reliability functions* of the channel W, when the type of the codewords must tend to Q_X.

We define by $C_0^-(Q_X, W)$ (respectively, $C_0^+(Q_X, W)$) the maximum of all rates such that $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ (respectively, $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$) is infinite, which can be regarded as the *zero-error capacity* of the channel W of fixed composition codes with codebook types which tends to Q_X. Fekete's Lemma [29, Lemma 11.2] implies that $C_0^-(Q_X, W) = C_0^+(Q_X, W)$ and thus we will denote henceforth both quantities by $C_0(Q_X, W)$. Notice that when W is not noiseless and $Q_X \in \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $C_0(Q_X, W) = 0$, namely, $C_0(Q_X, W)$ may be strictly positive only for types which belong to $\partial\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$. For any $Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$, we define

$$E_0^-(Q_X, W) \triangleq \lim_{\mathsf{R}\downarrow C_0(Q_X,W)} \underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \tag{16}$$

and $E_0^+(Q_X, W)$ is defined analogously.

Unfortunately, it is a long-standing open problem to find the exact values of $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ for an arbitrary rate $\mathsf{R} \in [0, I(Q_X \times W)]$, and it is not even known if $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) = \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ [29, Problem 10.7]. However, the following bounds on the fixed composition reliability function are well known when $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$. The random coding bound [29, Theorem 10.2] is a lower bound on the infimum fixed-composition

reliability function, given by

$$\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \geq E_{\text{rc}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \triangleq \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \left\{ D(Q_{Y|X}||W|Q_X) + \left[I(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}) - R \right]_+ \right\}. \tag{17}$$

Similarly, the expurgated lower bound [29, Problem 10.18] is given by

$$\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \geq E_{\text{ex}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \triangleq \min_{Q_{X\tilde{X}}\colon Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X,\, I(Q_{X\tilde{X}})\leq \mathsf{R}} \left\{ B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, W) + I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) - \mathsf{R} \right\} \tag{18}$$

where

$$B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, W) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{Q_{X\tilde{X}}}[d_W(X, \tilde{X})] \tag{19}$$

is the *Bhattacharyya distance*, namely

$$d_W(x, \tilde{x}) \triangleq -\log \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{W(y|x)W(y|\tilde{x})}. \tag{20}$$

The sphere packing exponent [29, Theorem 10.3] is an upper bound on the supremum fixed-composition reliability function and given by

$$\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \leq E_{\text{sp}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \triangleq \min_{Q_{Y|X}\colon I(Q_X\times Q_{Y|X})\leq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_{Y|X}||W|Q_X) \tag{21}$$

which is valid for rates except $R_\infty(Q_X, W)$, defined as the infimum of all rates such that $E_{\text{sp}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) < \infty$. An improved upper bound on the supremum fixed-composition reliability for low rates, is the straight line bound [29, Problem 10.30], [30, Section 3.8]. This bound is obtained by connecting the expurgated bound at $\mathsf{R} = 0$, which is known to be tight [29, Problem 10.21], with the sphere packing bound. Since specifying our results on the optimal rate function (Section IV) and excess rate exponents (Section V) of SW codes is fairly simple and does not contribute to intuition, we will not discuss this bound henceforth. On the same note, since $E_{\text{rc}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $E_{\text{ex}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ are not concave in Q_X, in general, then the error performance for a given fixed composition of type Q_X can be improved by a certain time-sharing structure in the random coding mechanism. According to this structure, for each randomly selected codeword, the block length is optimally subdivided into codeword segments that are randomly drawn from optimally chosen types, whose weighted average (with weights proportional to the segment lengths) conforms with the given Q_X. At zero-rate, the resulting expurgated error exponent is given by the upper concave envelope (UCE) of $E_{\text{ex}}(0, Q_X, W)$ [29, Problem 10.22]. Nonetheless, in many cases (see discussion in [31] and [32, Section 2]), $E_{\text{ex}}(0, Q_X, W)$ is already concave, and no improved bound can be obtained by taking the UCE (e.g., when $|\mathcal{X}|= 2$, $E_{\text{ex}}(0, Q_X, W)$ is concave). In ordinary channel coding (without input constraints) this improvement is usually not discussed, because the time-sharing structure does increase the maximum of $E_{\text{rc}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $E_{\text{ex}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ over Q_X. However, for the utilization of channel codes as components of a SW code the value of $E_{\text{rc}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $E_{\text{ex}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ at any given Q_X is of interest. Nonetheless, for the sake of simplicity of the exposition, throughout the sequel, we will not include this time-sharing mechanism in our discussions and

derivations, although their inclusion is conceptually not difficult.

In [18, Proposition 4] these bounds were shown to hold for any $Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$ from continuity arguments. We will use the convention that all the above bounds are formally infinite for negative rates. It can be deduced from the above bounds [29, Corollary 10.4], that there exists a *critical rate* $R_{\mathrm{cr}}(Q_X, W)$ such that for $\mathsf{R} \in [R_{\mathrm{cr}}(Q_X, W), I(Q_X \times W)]$, $E_{\mathrm{rb}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) = E_{\mathrm{sp}}(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$, and consequently $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) = \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$.

In Appendix B, we discuss the fixed-composition reliability functions, and obtain some of their properties, which are required for the proof of the theorems in Section III.

III. Error and Excess-Rate Exponents

For a SW code, a trade-off exists between the error exponent E_e, the target rate R, and the excess-rate exponent E_r. In subsection III-A, we discuss informally some known results regarding error exponents of fixed-rate SW codes and variable-rate SW codes, under an average rate constraint. We also discuss the excess-rate exponent function that they achieve.

Then, in subsection III-B, upper bounds (converse results) will be found on the supremum error and excess-rate exponents, and lower bounds (achievability results) on the infimum error and excess-rate exponents will be derived for type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes. It will be apparent that the gap between the lower and upper bounds is only due to the gap which exists, in general, between, the infimum and supremum channel reliability functions. Thus, whenever the channel reliability functions are equal, type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes are *optimal*. For this reason, as well as their intuitive plausibility, we will later analyze optimal (in a sense that will be made precise) type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes.

A. Previous Work

For a sequence of fixed-rate SW codes $\mathcal{S}$ at rate R_0, the excess-rate exponent function is trivially given by

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{R}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \mathsf{R} \leq \mathsf{R}_0 \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

Evidently, this function bears a strong dichotomy between rates below and above R_0. Bounds on the error exponents for fixed-rate SW coding were derived in [4, Theorems 2 and 3], [7, Theorem 1], [6, Theorem 2]. The analysis is essentially based on considering each type class of the source separately. Loosely speaking, for any given $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, there exists a partition of the type class $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ into bins, such that every bin corresponds to a channel code of rate $H(Q_X) - \mathsf{R}_0$, which achieves an error exponent function $\underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \mathsf{R}_0, Q_X, P_{Y|X})$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \doteq \exp\left[-nD(Q_X||P_X)\right]$, and the number of types increases only polynomially, the error exponent is given by[2]

$$\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}) \geq \min_{Q_X} \left\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + \underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \mathsf{R}_0, Q_X, P_{Y|X}) \right\}. \tag{23}$$

[2]We will prove (23) rigorously in Theorem 5.

It was observed in [18], [19] that sequences of variable-rate SW codes $\mathcal{S}$ may have better error exponents than those of fixed-rate SW codes, when an average rate constraint is imposed, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{X})] \leq \mathsf{R}_0$. Intuitively, since asymptotically, the average rate is only determined by the rate of types $\{Q_X\}$ that are 'close' (in a sense that was made precise in [18, Theorem 1] and [19, Theorems 1 and 2]) to the source P_X, one can allocate large rates to a-typical source blocks, transmit them uncoded using $\log_2|\mathcal{X}|$ bits, and the decoder will have zero-error for source blocks from these type classes. The result is that for such variable-rate SW codes, the supremum error exponent equals the conditional supremum error exponent of P_X at the rate R_0 assigned for source blocks with type 'close' to P_X, namely

$$\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S}) = \overline{E}_e^*(H(P_X) - \mathsf{R}_0, P_X, P_{Y|X}). \tag{24}$$

This can be thought of as a generalization of [7, Theorem 1] to variable-rate codes under an average-rate constraint. However, since the probability that Q_X would be away from P_X decays with an arbitrary small error exponent, the resulting excess-rate exponent function is given by $\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{R}) = 0$ for $\mathsf{R} \leq \log|\mathcal{X}|$, which is inferior to the infinite excess-rate exponent of fixed-rate coding for $\mathsf{R} \in (\mathsf{R}_0, \log|\mathcal{X}|)$. This excess-rate function can be improved, e.g., by coding each of the source blocks in the 'uncoded type classes' with $\log_2|\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)| \approx nH(Q_X)$ bits, and obtaining the same error exponent (24), and the excess-rate exponent for $\mathsf{R} \in (\mathsf{R}_0, \log|\mathcal{X}|)$ will be

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{R}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \mathsf{R} \leq \mathsf{R}_0 \\ \min_{H(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X) & \mathsf{R}_0 < \mathsf{R} \leq \log|\mathcal{X}| \end{cases}. \tag{25}$$

While this excess-rate exponent may be positive for $\mathsf{R} \in (\mathsf{R}_0, \log|\mathcal{X}|)$, it is nonetheless *finite*, in contrast to fixed-rate coding (22). In this paper, we will analyze systematically the trade-off between the error and excess-rate exponents for variable-rate codes, where the two above cases, i.e. fixed-rate and variable-rate with average rate constraint, may be considered as two extremes of this trade-off.

Since in [18], [19] the focus was on coding the source type P_X[3], the essence of [18, Theorem 1] and [19, Theorems 1 and 2] is an upper bound and a lower bound for $\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S}, P_X)$. Nonetheless, the proofs of these bounds are similar for any given type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. For the sake of completeness, and in order to establish this result in the current setting, we include a proof of the lower bound in Appendix A.

Theorem 2 (Variation of [18, Theorem 1])**.** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an arbitrary sequence of SW codes. Then, for every $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$*

$$\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S}, Q_X) \leq \overline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \overline{R}(Q_X; \mathcal{S}), Q_X, P_{Y|X}). \tag{26}$$

Also, for any $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$ there exists a sequence of type-dependent SW codes $\mathcal{S}^*$ with rates $r^*(\mathbf{x})$, such that for any $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large n, we have $r^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \overline{R}(Q_X; \mathcal{S}) + \delta$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}^*, Q_X) \geq \underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \overline{R}(Q_X; \mathcal{S}), Q_X, P_{Y|X}) - \delta. \tag{27}$$

[3]If $P_X \notin \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ then one can alternatively consider $P'_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ arbitrarily 'close' to P_X.

In [18], [19], the achievability result actually obtained was

$$\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S},Q_X) \geq \overline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X)-\overline{R}(Q_X;\mathcal{S}),Q_X,P_{Y|X})-\delta, \tag{28}$$

and (24) was proved. However, for the sake of the current setting, the statement of Theorem 2 is required, and it based on the additional properties of optimal channel codes derived in Lemma 26 in Appendix B. The reason is that in the proof of [18, Theorem 1] and Theorem 2 a *single* channel code is constructed and utilized for SW coding of a *single* type Q_X. By contrast, when considering the more refined notion of excess rate, *all* types $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ of the source should be considered at the same time, and as a result, many channel codes should be constructed (see the proof of Theorem 5 henceforth). Now, consider the simplified case of SW coding for just two different types. In this case, two channel codes are required for a 'good' SW coding of the two types. However, if the codes are designed to achieve the supremum reliability function, there is no guarantee that the block lengths of the codes will match, because the limit superior might not be achieved by the same sub-sequence of block lengths for both types. Specifically, for any given block length such that one of the codes has 'good' error probability (i.e., close to the probability guaranteed by the supremum reliability function), the other code might have 'poor' error probability, and vice versa. Since in order to construct a good SW code, we need to find a sequence of block lengths such that *both* channel codes have good error probability, this can only be guaranteed for the lower error exponent of the infimum reliability function. Indeed, for the infimum reliability function, good error probability is assured for all sufficiently large block lengths, and so, when the block length is sufficiently large, both channel codes, if properly designed, will have error probability close to the one guaranteed by the infimum reliability function.

B. Bounds on Exponents for General SW Codes

In this subsection, we derive upper and lower bounds on the error exponent and excess-rate exponent, which hold for any sequence of variable-rate SW codes. Unlike the case of Theorem 2, the exponent bounds, in this subsection should consider *all* possible types in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an arbitrary sequence of SW codes. Then,*

$$\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S}) \leq \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + \overline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X)-\overline{R}(Q_X;\mathcal{S}),Q_X,P_{Y|X}) \right\}. \tag{29}$$

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be any arbitrary sequence of SW codes. Then,*

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S},\mathsf{R}) \leq \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + \mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S},\mathsf{R},Q_X) \right\}. \tag{30}$$

Next, we derive an achievable error exponent and excess-rate exponent for type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes. The proof is based on the achievability result of Theorem 2, but when considering the notion of excess-rate exponent, attention need to be given to all types of the source.

Theorem 5. *For any given rate function $\rho(Q_X)$, there exists a sequence of type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes $\mathcal{S}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}) \geq \inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + \underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \rho(Q_X), Q_X, P_{Y|X}) \right\} \tag{31}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{R}) \geq \inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}):\, \rho(Q_X) > \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X). \tag{32}$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix A, but here we provide an intuitive outline of the SW code constructed. From Theorem 2, it is possible to construct a SW code $\mathcal{S}_n^*(Q_X)$ for any given $Q_X \in \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$, with conditional error probability converging to about $\exp\left[-n\underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \rho(Q_X), Q_X, P_{Y|X})\right]$. However, to obtain a SW code which satisfies (31) for a sufficiently long block lengths, the conditional error probability should be about $\exp\left[-n\underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \rho(Q_X)), Q_X, P_{Y|X})\right]$ *uniformly* over all types. Indeed, if uniform convergence is not satisfied then, for any given finite block length, there might be types Q_X such that the error probability of $\mathcal{S}_n^*(Q_X)$ is still far from its limit, and the error probability of this code may be a dominant factor in the total error probability. Thus, we have to prove uniform convergence of the error probability. Our strategy is as follows. We choose a large block length n_0, such that the types of $\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})$ are good approximations for all types in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, and construct good SW codes $\mathcal{S}_n^*(Q_X)$ for all $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})$. Since $|\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})|$ is finite, uniform convergence of the error probability of $\mathcal{S}_n^*(Q_X)$ holds. For any given n, upon observing a block from the source, we will modify it (namely, by truncating it and altering some of its components), so that the modified source block would have a type within $\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})$, and can then be encoded by one of the 'good' SW codes $\mathcal{S}_n^*(Q_X)$. The encoded modified vector will be sent to the decoder, along with the modification data. Then, at the decoder, the side information vector will be modified accordingly, so it appears as resulting from the memoryless source $P_{Y|X}$, but conditioning on the modified source block. Thus, the decoder of $\mathcal{S}_n^*(Q_X)$ can be used to decode the modified vector, and the modification data can be used to recover the actual source block.

Remark 6. According to Theorem 5 and the proof of the achievability part of Theorem 2, it is implicit that the *random binning exponent*, defined as

$$\min_{Q_{XY}} \left\{ D\left(Q_{XY}||P_{XY}\right) + \left[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+ \right\}. \tag{33}$$

may be achieved by using permutations of a channel code which achieve the random coding exponent. However, as is well known, for fixed-rate SW coding [2], one can achieve the error exponent by simple random binning, i.e. assigning source blocks to bins independently, with a uniform probability distributions over the bins. As a side result, in Appendix C, we generalize this ensemble to type-dependent, variable-rate random binning SW codes (defined rigorously therein), and prove that (33) (with some given rate function $\rho(Q_X)$ replacing R) is the *exact* exponent of this ensemble; a result analogous to [33] for random channel coding.

C. Trade-Off Between Exponents

As common in variable-rate SW coding, a trade-off exists between the error exponent and excess-rate exponent. In the remaining part of the paper, we explore this trade-off by requiring the achievability of a certain target error exponent E_e with maximal excess rate exponent. Theorem 5 shows that in order to achieve a target error exponent E_e, a type-dependent, variable-rate SW code may be employed. Then, Theorems 3 and 4 provide upper bounds which quantify the gap from optimal performance. Comparing Theorem 5 with Theorems 3 and 4, it is evident that there might be two origins for a gap between the bounds. The first one lies in the error exponent expression, and the second is in the excess-rate exponent. We now discuss these differences.

First, in general, it is yet to be known whether the inequality $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) \leq \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ may be strict. Thus, if for the minimizers in (32) and (31) a strict inequality occurs, then a gap exists between the upper and lower bounds for the SW code[4]. Nonetheless, it is also well known that for $\mathsf{R} \geq R_{\text{cr}}(Q_X, W)$, $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) = \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ is guaranteed, and so there are cases in which the upper and lower bounds coincide, especially at low target error exponents E_e. Second, on substituting a rate function $\rho(Q_X)$ of a type-dependent, variable-rate codes in (30), the resulting upper bound is different from the lower bound of (32), only if the function

$$\inf_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) > \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X || P_X) \tag{34}$$

is not left-continuous in R. As will turn out, for the class of rate functions of interest, left-continuity is satisfied, and the upper and lower bounds coincide. Thus, from the above discussion, we conclude that type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes are optimal for sufficiently low target error exponents E_e.

Since from Theorem 5, any target error exponent can be achieved with type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes, and because they are provably optimal in some domain, we henceforth consider only such SW codes. We will define *optimal* rate functions as follows.

Definition 7. A rate function $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ is said to be *inf-optimal*, if for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a sequence of type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes $\mathcal{S}$ with $\overline{R}(Q_X; \mathcal{S}) \leq \underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) + \delta$ and $\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}) \geq \mathsf{E}_e$, and for every other rate function $\rho(Q_X)$ with the above property, we have $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \leq \rho(Q_X)$, for all $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. The *sup-optimal* rate function $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ is defined analogously.

Notice that by definition, we have

$$\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \leq \underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e). \tag{35}$$

In Section IV, we will obtain bounds on the optimal rate functions for any given E_e, and in Section V, we will obtain bounds on the excess-rate performance for these optimal rate functions.

[4]In (32) and (31), a minimum might not be achieved. In this case, the last statement should be valid for all sequence of distributions which achieves the infimum.

IV. Optimal Rate Functions

In this section, we explore the optimal rate functions, for any given E_e. Before discussing specific bounds, we characterize them using the inverse of the fixed composition reliability function.

Theorem 5 implies that for $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ to be inf-optimal, we must have

$$\mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) + \underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e), Q_X, P_{Y|X}) \tag{36}$$

for any given $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. The following corollary is immediate from Proposition 27 in Appendix B.

Corollary 8. *As a function of* R*, the function* $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ *has a continuous inverse* $\underline{R}^*(\mathsf{E}_e, Q_X, W)$ *across the interval* $\mathsf{E}_e \in [0, E_0^-(Q_X, W))$*. An analogous result holds for* $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$*.*

Now, Corollary 8 immediately implies the following:

$$\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \leq \begin{cases} 0, & \mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) \\ H(Q_X) - \underline{R}^*(\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X), Q_X, P_{Y|X}), & D(Q_X||P_X) < \mathsf{E}_e < D(Q_X||P_X) + E_0^-(Q_X, W) \\ H(Q_X) - C_0(Q_X, P_{Y|X}), & \mathsf{E}_e \geq D(Q_X||P_X) + E_0^-(Q_X, W), \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

where $E_0^-(Q_X, W)$ is as defined in (16), and $\underline{R}^*(\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X), Q_X, P_{Y|X})$ is as defined in Corollary 8.

Similarly, Theorem 3 implies that $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ cannot be sup-optimal unless

$$\mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) + \overline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e), Q_X, P_{Y|X}) \tag{38}$$

for any given $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. Now Corollary 8 implies:

$$\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \geq \begin{cases} 0, & \mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) \\ H(Q_X) - \overline{R}^*(\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X), Q_X, P_{Y|X}), & D(Q_X||P_X) < \mathsf{E}_e < D(Q_X||P_X) + E_0^+(Q_X, W) \\ H(Q_X) - C_0(Q_X, P_{Y|X}), & \mathsf{E}_e \geq D(Q_X||P_X) + E_0^+(Q_X, W). \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

In Definition 7, $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ is only defined for $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. This is because the value of $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ for $Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})\backslash\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ (any irrational PMF) has no operational meaning, and does not affect exponents (see Theorems 2, 4, and 5). Thus, for $Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})\backslash\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we may arbitrarily define it as the lower semi-continuous extension of $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$. Specifically, for any given $Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})\backslash\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ we henceforth define

$$\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \triangleq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{Q'_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}): ||Q'_X - Q_X|| \leq \epsilon} \underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e), \tag{40}$$

and the same convention will be used for $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$.

Lemma 9. *The rate function $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ is regular and strictly increasing in the range*

$$\mathsf{E}_e \in \left(D(Q_X||P_X), E_0^-(Q_X, W)\right). \tag{41}$$

The same properties hold for $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$.

Proof: These properties follow directly from Proposition 27 and Corollary 8. ■

Next, we provide specific bounds on the optimal rate functions. Generally, any bound on the reliability function may be used, but we will focus on the *random binning exponent* and *expurgated exponent* as lower bounds to the largest achievable exponent, and the *sphere packing exponent* as an upper bound. In essence, these bounds are generalizations of the random binning bound [4, Theorem 2], [6, Theorem 2], the expurgated bound, which follows from [6, Theorem 2], and the sphere packing bound [4, Theorem 3] for type-dependent, variable-rate SW coding. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that $C_0(Q_X, P_{Y|X}) = 0$ for all Q_X, and so the expurgated and sphere packing exponents are finite for every positive rate. The results are easily generalized to the case of $C_0(Q_X, P_{Y|X}) > 0$.

We first need some definitions. For brevity, the dependency in Q_X for the defined quantities is omitted. Let

$$Q'_{Y|X} \triangleq \arg\min_{Q_{Y|X}} \left\{I(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)\right\}, \tag{42}$$

$$Q'_{\tilde{X}|X} \triangleq \arg\min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}:\, Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X} \left\{B(Q_X \times Q_{\tilde{X}|X}, P_{Y|X}) + I(Q_X \times Q_{\tilde{X}|X})\right\}, \tag{43}$$

where $B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})$ is defined in (19). Next, define $\mathsf{E}_{e,0} = D(Q_X||P_X)$ as well as[5]

$$\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-rb}} \triangleq D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q'_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X), \tag{44}$$

$$\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-rb}} \triangleq D(Q_X||P_X) + I(Q_X \times Q'_{Y|X}) + D(Q'_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X), \tag{45}$$

$$\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-ex}} \triangleq D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_X \times Q'_{\tilde{X}|X}, P_{Y|X}), \tag{46}$$

$$\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-ex}} \triangleq D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_X \times Q_X, P_{Y|X}), \tag{47}$$

and

$$\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-sp}} \triangleq D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_X \times (Q_X \times P_{Y|X})_Y||P_{XY}). \tag{48}$$

Also, define the sets

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{rb}} \triangleq \left\{Q_{Y|X} : D(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}||P_{XY}) \le \mathsf{E}_e\right\}, \tag{49}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{ex}} \triangleq \left\{Q_{\tilde{X}|X} : Q_{\tilde{X}} = Q_X,\ \mathsf{E}_e = D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})\right\} \tag{50}$$

and let $\mathcal{A}_{\text{sp}} \triangleq \mathcal{A}_{\text{rb}}$.

[5]The subscript 'a' represents the word 'affine'.

The random binning rate function is defined as

$$\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\triangleq\begin{cases}0, & \mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,0}\\ \mathsf{E}_e+H(Q_X)-D(Q_X||P_X) & \\ -\min_{Q_{Y|X}\in\mathcal{A}_{\text{rb}}}\left\{I(Q_X\times Q_{Y|X})+D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)\right\}, & \mathsf{E}_{e,0}<\mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-rb}}\\ \mathsf{E}_e-\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-rb}}+H(Q_X)-I(Q_X\times Q'_{Y|X}), & \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-rb}}<\mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-rb}}\\ H(Q_X), & \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-rb}}<\mathsf{E}_e\end{cases}\tag{51}$$

and the expurgated rate function is defined as

$$\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\triangleq\begin{cases}0, & \mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,0}\\ \mathsf{E}_e-\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-ex}}+H(Q_X)-I(Q_X\times Q'_{\tilde{X}|X}), & \mathsf{E}_{e,0}<\mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-ex}}\\ H(Q_X)-\min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\in\mathcal{A}_{\text{ex}}}I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}), & \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-ex}}<\mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-ex}}\\ H(Q_X), & \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-ex}}>D(Q_X||P_X)+B(Q_X\times Q_X,P_{Y|X})\end{cases}\tag{52}$$

and the sphere packing rate function is defined as

$$\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\triangleq\begin{cases}0, & \mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,0}\\ H(Q_X)-\min_{Q_{Y|X}\in\mathcal{A}_{\text{sp}}}I(Q_X\times Q_{Y|X}), & \mathsf{E}_{e,0}<\mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-sp}}\\ H(Q_X), & \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-sp}}<\mathsf{E}_e.\end{cases}\tag{53}$$

Theorem 10. *For any given* E_e *and* $Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$

$$\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\le\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\le\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\le\min\{\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e),\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\}.\tag{54}$$

Due to the similarity between the random binning bound and sphere packing bound, we obtain the known property from channel coding: For any Q_X there exists $\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{cr}}(Q_X)$ such that if $\mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{cr}}(Q_X)$ we get $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)=\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)$. Thus, for any required E_e, if $\mathsf{E}_e\le\mathsf{E}_{e,\text{cr}}(Q_X)$ then the optimal rate function is exactly known. Specifically, the right limit of the optimal rate function $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)$ at its discontinuity point $\mathsf{E}_{e,0}$ can be easily evaluated from (51) to be

$$\lim_{\mathsf{E}_e\downarrow\mathsf{E}_{e,0}}\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)=H(Q_X)-D(P_{Y|X}||Q_Y^*|Q_X)\tag{55}$$

where $Q_Y^*(y)=\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}Q_X(x)P_{Y|X}(y|x)$. Namely, the resulting rate is the conditional entropy $H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)$ of the distribution $Q_{XY}=Q_X\times P_{Y|X}$. Especially, for $Q_X=P_X$ we have that $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\epsilon)\ge H(P_{X|Y}|P_Y)$, for all $\epsilon>0$, as expected. The following lemma provides several simple properties of the rate functions $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)$, $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)$ and $\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)$.

Lemma 11. *The rate functions $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$, $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ and $\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ have the following properties:*

- *Strictly positive for $\mathsf{E}_e > \mathsf{E}_{e,0}$.*
- *Strictly increasing as a function of $\mathsf{E}_e \geq \mathsf{E}_{e,0}$ and $\mathsf{E}_e \leq \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-rb}}$ (for random binning) or $\mathsf{E}_e \leq \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-ex}}$ (for expurgated) and $\mathsf{E}_e \leq \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{max-sp}}$ (for sphere packing).*
- *Concave in $\mathsf{E}_e \in (\mathsf{E}_{e,0}, \infty)$.*
- *Regular rate functions.*

As for capacity and error exponents in channel coding, the computation of the bounds on the optimal rate function requires the solution of a non-trivial optimization problem. We defer the discussion on this matter to Section VI, where we discuss iterative algorithms for the computation of the bounds on the optimal rate functions, as well as their excess-rate performance. Nonetheless, in Appendix D, we provide analytic approximations for $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ and $\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ in the case of weakly correlated sources[6].

V. Excess-Rate Performance

In this section, we evaluate the excess-rate exponent of the optimal rate functions bounds, as defined in Section IV. This results in lower and upper bounds on the maximal achievable excess rate exponent for a given error exponent, and thus the characterization of the optimal trade-off between error exponent and excess-rate exponent.

Notice that for a general rate function $\rho(\cdot)$, and target rates $\mathsf{R} \in (\mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{x})], \max_{Q_X} \rho(Q_X))$, the excess-rate exponent is strictly positive and finite. The next lemma shows that the upper bound of (30) and the lower bound of (32) coincide for regular rate functions. Since in Lemma 11 it was shown that inf/sup optimal rate functions as well as the random binning, expurgated and sphere packing rate functions are all regular rate functions, this means that we have the exact expression for their excess-rate performance.

Lemma 12. *For a regular rate function $\rho(Q_X)$*

$$\inf_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) > \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X || P_X) = \min_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X || P_X). \tag{56}$$

We now mention a few general properties of excess-rate exponents functions.

Lemma 13. *Let $\rho(Q_X)$ be a rate function, and $\mathsf{R}_{\max} \triangleq \sup_{Q_X} \rho(Q_X)$. If $\rho(Q_X)$ is regular, let $\mathsf{R}'_{\max} \triangleq \sup_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}} \rho(Q_X)$. The excess-rate exponent $E_r(\mathsf{R})$ for the rate function $\rho(Q_X)$ has the following properties:*

- *$E_r(\mathsf{R}) = 0$ for $\mathsf{R} \in [0, \rho(P_X)]$.*
- *$E_r(\mathsf{R}) = \infty$ for $\mathsf{R} \in (\mathsf{R}_{\max}, \infty)$.*
- *$E_r(\mathsf{R})$ is increasing in $[\rho(P_X), \mathsf{R}_{\max}]$. If $\rho(Q_X)$ is regular, then $E_r(\mathsf{R})$ is strictly increasing in $[\rho(P_X), \mathsf{R}'_{\max}]$.*
- *$E_r(\mathsf{R})$ is continuous in $[\rho(P_X), \mathsf{R}_{\max}]$ except for a countable number of points. If $\rho(Q_X)$ is regular, then $E_r(\mathsf{R})$ is left-continuous in $[\rho(P_X), \mathsf{R}'_{\max}]$.*

[6]The expurgated bound is not very useful in this regime [30, Section 3.4].

In the rest of the section, we assume that a target error exponent E_e is given and fixed. Thus, for brevity, we omit the notation of the dependence of various quantities on it. We define the excess-rate exponent of the inf-optimal rate function as

$$\underline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R}) \triangleq \min_{Q_X:\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X), \tag{57}$$

and analogously, define $\overline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R})$. Similarly, we define the random-binning excess-rate exponent as

$$E_{r,\text{rb}}(\mathsf{R}) \triangleq \min_{Q_X:\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X), \tag{58}$$

and analogously define $E_{r,\text{ex}}(\mathsf{R})$ and $E_{r,\text{sp}}(\mathsf{R})$. For a given R, we evidently have

$$\max\{E_{r,\text{rb}}(\mathsf{R}), E_{r,\text{ex}}(\mathsf{R})\} \leq \underline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R}) \leq \overline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R}) \leq E_{r,\text{sp}}(\mathsf{R}). \tag{59}$$

For some R, let the minimizer in (58) be Q_X^*. Then, if $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X^*, \mathsf{E}_e) = \rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X^*, \mathsf{E}_e)$, it is easy to verify that the bounds in (59) are tight, and $\underline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R}) = \overline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R}) = E_{r,\text{rb}}(\mathsf{R})$. In other cases, one can use the upper bound at the rate function $\rho_{\text{ub}}^* = \min\{\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e), \rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)\}$ to obtain an excess-rate exponent $E_{r,\text{ub}}(\mathsf{R})$, defined similarly to (58). In this case, an improvement over the random-binning and expurgated excess-rate exponents is guaranteed, as

$$\max\{E_{r,\text{rb}}(\mathsf{R}), E_{r,\text{ex}}(\mathsf{R})\} \leq E_{r,\text{ub}}(\mathsf{R}). \tag{60}$$

Next, we evaluate the bounds on the optimal excess-rate exponent, e.g., as in (58). However, as we have seen, $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$, as well as the other rate functions, are not given analytically, and performing the maximization in (58) directly may be prohibitively complex, especially when $|\mathcal{X}|$ is large. Thus, we describe an indirect method to evaluate the excess-rate bounds. For a given R, any curve $\mathsf{E}_r = E_r(\mathsf{R})$ may be characterized by a condition that verifies whether the rate and excess-rate pair $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ is either below or above the curve. The proof is based on the following lemma, that introduces a rate function which is designed to achieve pointwise $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$, but not necessarily E_e.

Lemma 14. *Let*

$$\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r) \triangleq \begin{cases} \mathsf{R}, & D(Q_X||P_X) < \mathsf{E}_r \\ \mathsf{R}_0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \tag{61}$$

Then, if there exists R_0 such that $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ achieves infimum error exponent E_e then $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ achieves infimum error exponent E_e with rate R and excess-rate exponent E_r. If $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ does not achieve supremum error exponent E_e then $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ does not achieve supremum error exponent E_e with rate R and excess-rate exponent E_r.

Proof:

($\Leftarrow$) Assume that $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ achieves $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ with an infimum error exponent E_e. Clearly the definition of an

optimal rate function imply that $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ also achieves $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$.

($\Rightarrow$) Assume that $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ achieves $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$. If Q_X satisfies $D(Q_X||P_X) \geq \mathsf{E}_r$ then for

$$\mathsf{R}_0 \geq \max_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X)\geq \mathsf{E}_r} \overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \tag{62}$$

we get $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r) \geq \overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$. Else, if $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r) > \mathsf{R}$ for some Q_X that satisfies $D(Q_X||P_X) < \mathsf{E}_r$, then $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ does not achieve $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ using Lemma 12. Thus, we must have $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r) \geq \overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ for all Q_X and this implies that $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ also achieves supremum error exponent E_e. It is easy to see that $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ has excess-rate exponent E_r at rate R directly from its construction and Lemma 12. ■

Notice that the rate function $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$, introduced in the previous lemma, has only *pointwise* optimal excess-rate exponent, in the sense that for the given $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ it achieves the optimal trade-off between the error exponent and excess-rate exponent. By contrast, the optimal rate functions $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ and $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ achieve the optimal excess-rate exponent, at any given rate.

Define for a given $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\text{rb}}(t, Q_X, Q_{Y|X}) \;\triangleq\; & D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \\ & + t \cdot \left[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

$$e_{\text{rb}}(t) \triangleq \min_{Q_X: D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \Gamma_{\text{rb}}(t, Q_X, Q_{Y|X}). \tag{64}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\text{ex}}(t, Q_X, Q_{\tilde{X}|X}) \;\triangleq\; & D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) \\ & + t\left[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}})\right]\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

$$e_{\text{ex}}(t) \triangleq \min_{Q_X: D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}:\, Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X} \Gamma_{\text{ex}}(t, Q_X, Q_{\tilde{X}|X}). \tag{66}$$

Also, define

$$\Gamma_{\text{sp}}(t, Q_X, Q_{Y|X}) \triangleq \Gamma_{\text{rb}}(t, Q_X, Q_{Y|X}) \tag{67}$$

$$e_{\text{sp}}(t) \triangleq e_{\text{rb}}(t). \tag{68}$$

Theorem 15. *If*

$$\max\left\{\max_{0\leq t\leq 1} e_{\text{rb}}(t), \max_{t\geq 1} e_{\text{ex}}(t)\right\} \geq \mathsf{E}_e \tag{69}$$

then there exists a sequence of SW codes with infimum error exponent E_e*, and excess-rate exponent* E_r *at rate* R*. Conversely, if*

$$\max_{t\geq 0} e_{\text{sp}}(t) < \mathsf{E}_e \tag{70}$$

then there is no sequence of SW codes with supremum error exponent E_e*, and excess-rate exponent* E_r *at rate* R*.*

Notice that the functions $e_{\text{rb}}(t)$, $e_{\text{ex}}(t)$ and $e_{\text{sp}}(t)$ are concave functions of t (as pointwise minimum of linear functions in t), and thus the maximization over t is relatively simple to perform. In addition, $\max_{0\leq t\leq 1} e_{\text{rb}}(t)$, $\max_{t\geq 1} e_{\text{ex}}(t)$ and $\max_{t\geq 0} e_{\text{sp}}(t)$ are non-increasing functions of E_r and so for any given constraint on E_e and target rate R, a simple line search algorithm will find $E_r(\mathsf{R}) = \min\{\mathsf{E}_r : (\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r) \text{ is achievable for } \mathsf{E}_e\}$. Thus, the computational problem is to compute $e_{\text{rb}}(t)$, $e_{\text{ex}}(t)$ and $e_{\text{sp}}(t)$, for any given t. We address this matter in Section VI.

For the sake of comparison, we mention fixed-rate coding and coding under average rate constraint. In the case of fixed-rate coding, to ensure an infimum error exponent of E_e one must use $\rho(Q_X) = \mathsf{R}_0 = \max_{Q'_X} \underline{\rho}^*(Q'_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ for all Q_X, and the excess-rate exponent is as in (22). For coding under average rate constraint, to ensure an infimum error exponent of E_e one can choose $\rho(P_X) = \underline{\rho}^*(P_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ and $\rho(Q_X) = H(Q_X)$ otherwise, and the excess-rate exponent is as in (25). It is also evident that if $\max_{Q'_X} \underline{\rho}^*(Q'_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = \underline{\rho}^*(P_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ then fixed-rate coding is optimal and the excess rate exponent cannot be improved beyond that of fixed-rate.

VI. Computational Algorithms

As we have seen in Sections IV and V, in order to compute the bounds on the optimal rate functions and the resulting excess-rate performance, some optimization problems need to be solved. In essence, since the bounds on the optimal rate functions stem from the bounds on channel coding error exponents, any computational algorithm for channel coding error exponents may be used, e.g. [34], [35]. However, these classical algorithms are given for Gallager-style bounds [3], not the form of Csiszár and Körner [29], used in this paper. In addition, they form the basis for the computational algorithm of the excess-rate performance for the random binning and sphere packing bounds.

For the random binning and sphere packing rate functions (51),(53), it is required to compute[7]

$$v_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e, \eta) \triangleq \min_{Q_{Y|X}: D(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X} || P_{XY}) \leq \mathsf{E}_e} \left\{ D(Q_{Y|X} || Q_Y | Q_X) + \eta \cdot D(Q_{Y|X} || P_{Y|X} | Q_X) \right\}, \tag{71}$$

where η is 1 for (51) and 0 for (53). For expurgated rate function (52) it is required to compute[8]

$$v_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \triangleq \min_{Q_{X\tilde{X}}: B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) + D(Q_X || P_X) = \mathsf{E}_e,\, Q_X = Q_{\tilde{X}}} D(Q_{\tilde{X}|X} || Q_{\tilde{X}} | Q_X). \tag{72}$$

Moreover, to compute the bounds on the excess-rate performance in (64) and (66), the values of $e_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$

[7]Notice that the affine (third) term in (51) can simply be obtained by setting $\mathsf{E}_e = \infty$. The solution in this case is $Q'_{Y|X}$.

[8]The affine (second) term in (52) can be handled by similar methods. The solution in this case is simply $Q'_{Z|X}$.

Algorithm 1 Alternating minimization algorithm for the computation of $v_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e, \eta)$

Input: A source P_{XY}, a type Q_X, a target error exponent E_e and $\eta \geq 0$.

Output: The value of $v_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e, \eta)$ and the optimal solution $Q^*_{Y|X}$.

1) Initialize $\tilde{Q}_Y$ randomly such that $\text{supp}(\tilde{Q}_Y) = \text{supp}(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X P_{Y|X})$.
2) Iterate over the following steps until convergence:
   a) Set $Q_{Y|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \frac{\eta}{1+\eta})$. If $D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) < \mathsf{E}_e$ then set $\alpha = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$. Else, find $\alpha^* \in [\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}, 1]$ that satisfies
   $$D\left(\mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \alpha^*)||P_{Y|X}|Q_X\right) = \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) \tag{74}$$
   and set $Q_{Y|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \alpha^*)$.
   b) Set $\tilde{Q}_Y(y) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$.
3) Let the converged variable be α^* and $\tilde{Q}^*_Y$. Then, set $Q_{Y|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}^*_Y, \alpha^*)$ in (71). Return.

and $e_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$ need to be computed[9]. In this section, we provide explicit iterative algorithms to compute $v_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e, \eta)$, $v_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ and $e_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$, and prove their correctness. The merit of these algorithms is that they require at most a one-dimensional optimization, regardless of the alphabet sizes $|\mathcal{X}|$ and $|\mathcal{Y}|$. The optimization problem of $e_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$ is briefly discussed, and shown to be convex, rendering it feasible to compute using generic algorithms.

Throughout, we will utilize an auxiliary PMF $\tilde{Q}_Y$. For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, define the *geometric combination mapping* $\mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \alpha)$ whose output $\acute{Q}_{Y|X}$ satisfies

$$\acute{Q}_{Y|X}(y|x) \triangleq \psi_x P^{\alpha}_{Y|X}(y|x) \tilde{Q}^{1-\alpha}_Y(y), \tag{73}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where ψ_x is a normalization factor, chosen such that $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \acute{Q}_{Y|X}(y|x) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The following algorithm provides a method to compute $v_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e, \eta)$.

Lemma 16. *Algorithm 1 outputs* $v_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e, \eta)$.

Algorithm 1 is presented for a specific E_e, but it is also useful if one is interested in the full curve $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$. To compute the second term in the random binning rate function (51) one needs to compute

$$\min_{Q_{Y|X}\in\mathcal{A}_{\text{rb}}} I(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \tag{75}$$

$$= \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \max_{\lambda\geq 0} D(Q_{Y|X}||Q_Y|Q_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) + \lambda\left(D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) - \mathsf{E}_e\right) \tag{76}$$

$$\overset{(a)}{=} \max_{\lambda\geq 0} \left\{ \lambda\left(D(Q_X||P_X) - \mathsf{E}_e\right) + \min_{Q_{Y|X}} D(Q_{Y|X}||Q_Y|Q_X) + (1+\lambda) D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \right\} \tag{77}$$

where (a) is because the minimization problem is convex. The KKT optimality conditions [36, Section 5.5.3] imply that for any given $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$ the inner minimizer $Q^*_{Y|X}(\lambda)$ of last line in (77) is also the optimal solution for (77),

[9]For concreteness, we have made explicit the dependence of $e_{\text{rb}}(t)$ and $e_{\text{ex}}(t)$ on $(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$.

Algorithm 2 Alternating minimization algorithm for the computation of $e_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$

Input: A source P_{XY}, a target rate R, a target excess-rate E_r and $t \geq 0$.

Output: The value of $e_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$.

1) Initialize $\tilde{Q}_Y$ randomly such that $\text{supp}(\tilde{Q}_Y) = \mathcal{Y}$, and set $\overline{Q}_{Y|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \frac{1}{1+t})$ and compute h_1 and h_2.
2) Iterate over the following steps until convergence:
   a) Set $\overline{Q}_X = \mathbb{M}_{\text{h}}(P_X, h_1, h_2, 0, t)$. If $D(\overline{Q}_X||P_X) < \mathsf{E}_r$ then set $\lambda = 0$. Else, find $\lambda^* > 0$ that satisfies
   $$D(\mathbb{M}_{\text{h}}(P_X, h_1, h_2, \lambda, t)||P_X) = \mathsf{E}_r \tag{82}$$
   and set $\overline{Q}_X = \mathbb{M}_{\text{h}}(P_X, h_1, h_2, \lambda^*, t)$.
   b) Set $\tilde{Q}_Y(y) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \overline{Q}_X(x)\overline{Q}_{Y|X}(y|x)$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, set $\overline{Q}_{Y|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \frac{1}{1+t})$ and compute h_1 and h_2.
3) Let the converged variables be λ^* and $\tilde{Q}_Y^*$. Set $\overline{Q}_X, \overline{Q}_{Y|X}$ in (64). Return.

whenever the error exponent constraint in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{rb}}$ is given by

$$\mathsf{E}_e(\lambda) = D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q^*_{Y|X}(\lambda)||P_{Y|X}|Q_X). \tag{78}$$

Clearly, Algorithm 1 is suitable for the inner minimization in (77), simply by setting $\eta = \lambda + 1$ and $\mathsf{E}_e = \infty$. Equivalently, this means that in step 2a of the algorithm, we always set $\alpha^* = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta} = \frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda+2}$. Otherwise stated, when α^* varies from 1 to $\frac{1}{2}$, the curved part of $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ is exhausted.

Next, Algorithm 2 provides a method to compute $e_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$. The technique is somewhat similar to Algorithm 1, but here an additional optimization is carried out over Q_X. For this algorithm, we define

$$h_{1,t}(x) \triangleq D(\overline{Q}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)||P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)), \tag{79}$$

$$h_{2,t}(x) \triangleq D(\overline{Q}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)||\tilde{Q}_Y), \tag{80}$$

where $\overline{Q}_{Y|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \frac{1}{1+t})$, as well as the mapping $\mathbb{M}_{\text{h}}(P_X, h_1, h_2, \lambda, t)$ whose output $\overline{Q}_X$ satisfies

$$\overline{Q}_X(x) = \psi \cdot [P_X(x)]^{\frac{1+\lambda}{1+\lambda+t}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1+t+\lambda} \cdot h_{1,t}(x) - \frac{t}{1+t+\lambda} \cdot h_{2,t}(x)\right), \tag{81}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where ψ is a normalization factor, such that $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \overline{Q}_X(x) = 1$.

Lemma 17. *Algorithm 2 outputs* $e_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$.

Next, Algorithm 3 provides a method to compute $v_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$. We define the *Bhattacharyya mapping* $\mathbb{M}_{\text{B}}(Q_{\tilde{X}|X}, P_{Y|X}, \lambda)$ whose output $\acute{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}$ satisfies

$$\acute{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) \triangleq \psi_x Q_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) \exp\left[-\lambda \cdot d_{P_{Y|X}}(x, \tilde{x})\right] \tag{83}$$

for all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, and ψ_x is a normalization constant, such that $\sum_{\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \acute{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) = 1$, for any $x \in \text{supp}(Q_X)$.

Algorithm 3 Iterative scaling algorithm for the computation of $v_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$

Input: A source P_{XY}, a type Q_X and a target error exponent E_e.

Output: The value of $v_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ and the optimal solution $Q^*_{\tilde{X}|X}$.

1) Initialize $Q^{(0)}_{X\tilde{X}}(x, \tilde{x}) = Q_X(x)Q_X(\tilde{x})$ for all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$.
2) For $k = 1, \ldots$, iterate over the following steps until convergence:
   a) Find $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies $B(Q_X \times \mathbb{M}_{\text{B}}(Q^{(2k-2)}_{\tilde{X}|X}, P_{Y|X}, \lambda)) + D(Q_X||P_X) = \mathsf{E}_e$, and set $Q^{(2k-1)}_{\tilde{X}|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{B}}(Q^{(2k-2)}_{\tilde{X}|X}, P_{Y|X}, \lambda^*)$.
   b) Set $Q^{(2k)}_{X\tilde{X}} = \mathbb{M}_{\text{l}}(Q_X \times Q^{(2k-1)}_{\tilde{X}|X})$.
3) Let the converged variables be $Q^*_{X\tilde{X}}(x, \tilde{x})$. Then, set $Q^*_{X\tilde{X}}(x, \tilde{x})$ in (72). Return.

Similarly, define the *lumping mapping* $\mathbb{M}_{\text{l}}(Q_{X\tilde{X}})$ whose output $\acute{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}$ satisfies

$$\acute{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}(x, \tilde{x}) = Q_X(\tilde{x}) \cdot \frac{Q_{X\tilde{X}}(x, \tilde{x})}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} Q_{X\tilde{X}}(x', \tilde{x})} \tag{84}$$

for all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$.

Lemma 18. *Algorithm 3 outputs* $v_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$.

Finally, we discuss the computation of $e_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{\text{ex}}(P_{XY}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r, t) &= \min_{Q_X : D(Q_X||P_X) \le \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X} : (Q_X \times Q_{\tilde{X}|X}) = Q_X} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) \\
&\quad + t \cdot \Big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_X) + D(Q_{\tilde{X}|X}||Q_{\tilde{X}}|Q_X) \Big] \Big\} \qquad (85) \\
&= \min_{Q_X : D(Q_X||P_X) \le \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X} : (Q_X \times Q_{\tilde{X}|X}) = Q_X} \min_{\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}}} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) \\
&\quad + t \cdot \Big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_X) + D(Q_{\tilde{X}|X}||\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}}|Q_X) \Big] \Big\} \qquad (86) \\
&= \min_{Q_{X\tilde{X}} : D(Q_X||P_X) \le \mathsf{E}_r,\, Q_X = Q_{\tilde{X}}} \min_{\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}}} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) \\
&\quad + t \cdot \Big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_X) + D(Q_{X\tilde{X}}||Q_X \times \tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}}) \Big] \Big\}. \qquad (87)
\end{aligned}$$

It can be easily seen that the resulting optimization problem is convex in the variables $(\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}}, Q_{X\tilde{X}})$, and can be solved by any general solver. Unfortunately, we have not been able to prove that alternating minimization algorithm converges (and even in this event, there is no explicit solution for the optimal $Q_{X\tilde{X}}$ given some $\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}}$).

VII. A Numerical Example

In this section, we provide a simple numerical example to illustrate the bounds obtained in previous sections, utilizing the computational algorithms of Section VI. Let the alphabets be $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, \chi, 1\}$, P_X be

given by $P_X(0) = 1 - P_X(1) = 0.2$, and $P_{Y|X}$ be given by the following transition probability matrix

$$P_{Y|X} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 & 0.15 & 0.05 \\ 0.05 & 0.15 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{88}$$

Figure 1 shows the bounds on the optimal rate functions (in nats) for Q_X given by $Q_X(0) = 1 - Q_X(1) = 0.25$ as a function of E_e. The points at which $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ ($\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$) becomes (respectively, ceases to be) affine with a unity slope are indicated by a vertical lines. For small E_e, the random binning and sphere packing bounds coincide, and so, $\overline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = \rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = \rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = \underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$.

Figure 2 shows the bounds on the optimal rate functions (in nats), for all possible types (indexed by $Q_X(0)$) for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.05$ and $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.2$. It can be seen that indeed this optimal function is in the form of a regular rate function, and that for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.05$ the optimal rate function is exactly known, for all types of the source. For comparison, the entropies $H(Q_X)$ and $H(\tilde{Q}_{X|Y}|\tilde{Q}_Y)$ where $\tilde{Q}_{XY} = Q_X \times P_{Y|X}$ are also plotted, and the rates for P_X are marked. The bounds on the optimal excess-rate exponent are computed and plotted in Figure 3 for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.05$ and in Figure 4 for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.2$. As before, for the smaller E_e the optimal excess-rate exponent is obtained exactly, while a gap exists for the larger E_e. It can be verified that Figure 2 and Figure 3 are consistent. For example, for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.05$ it can be seen in Figure 2 that when the type is $Q_X = P_X$, the rate is $\underline{\rho}^*(P_X, 0.05) = \overline{\rho}^*(P_X, 0.05) \approx 0.377$ nats so the excess-rate exponent is $\underline{E}_r^*(0.377) = \overline{E}_r^*(0.377) = 0$. Then, as $Q_X(0)$ increases, the rate also increases, up to its maximal value of $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X^*, 0.05) = \overline{\rho}^*(Q_X^*, 0.05) \approx 0.4$, for $Q_X^*(0) \approx 0.2574$. The excess-rate exponent is determined by the divergence of this type from the true source P_X, and given by $\underline{E}_r^*(0.4) = \overline{E}_r^*(0.4) \approx D(Q_X^*||P_X) \approx 10^{-2}$. This is the maximal value of $\underline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R})$ shown in Figure 3, and for larger rates, clearly $\underline{E}_r^*(\mathsf{R}) = \infty$.

For comparison, we also consider fixed-rate coding. From Figure 3, for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.05$ we have $\underline{E}_r^*(0.3921) = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$. It can be found that if one uses fixed-rate coding, at rate $\mathsf{R}_0 = 0.3921$, for all Q_X then the error exponent achieved is only $\mathsf{E}_e \approx 0.045$. Therefore, if the *finite* excess-rate exponent of variable-rate coding is tolerated, then this provides an improvement in the error exponent over fixed-rate coding.

VIII. Summary

In this paper, we have considered the trade-off between error and excess-rate exponents for variable-rate SW coding. The cases of fixed-rate coding and variable-rate coding under average constraints may be considered as two extreme points in this trade-off. In fixed-rate coding the same rate is assigned to all possible types, and so, the maximal excess-rate exponent is achieved, but at the price of minimal error exponent. In average-rate coding, the main concern is the coding of the true type of the source, and all other types are sent uncoded. The resulting error exponent is maximal, but at the price of minimal excess-rate exponent. Thus, for a coding system with more stringent instantaneous rate demands, it is necessary to lose some of the gains in error exponent of variable-rate coding, and improve the excess-rate exponent. In this work, we have derived bounds on rate functions which achieve the optimal trade-off, and analyzed their excess-rate performance, for a given requirement on the error exponent.



Figure 1. Bounds on the optimal rate functions for the type $Q_X(0.25) = 0.25$.



Figure 2. Bounds on the optimal rate functions for a given E_e.



Figure 3. Bounds on the optimal excess-rate exponent for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.05$.



Figure 4. Bounds on the optimal excess-rate exponent for $\mathsf{E}_e = 0.2$.

Before we conclude, we briefly outline two possible extensions. In many practical cases, there is some uncertainty regarding the source $P_{XY} = P_X \times P_{Y|X}$. Clearly, if independence between X and Y is a possible scenario, then in this worst case, the side information $\mathbf{y}$ is useless (when no feedback link exists). In other cases, it may be known that $P_{XY} \in \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ for some family of distributions $\mathcal{F}$. In this case, a possible requirement is that the rate function $\rho(Q_X)$ will be chosen to achieve error exponent of E_e uniformly for all sources in $\mathcal{F}$. With a slight change and abuse of notation, we define, e.g. the infimum optimal rate function for the source P_{XY} as $\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e; P_{XY})$ and the optimal rate function for the family $\mathcal{F}$ as

$$\underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e; \mathcal{F}) \triangleq \max_{P_{XY} \in \mathcal{F}} \underline{\rho}^*(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e; P_{XY}). \tag{89}$$

This maximization is (relatively) easy to perform if, e.g., the conditional probability $P_{Y|X}$ is known exactly, and in addition, a *nominal* $\tilde{P}_X$ is known such that the actual P_X satisfies $D(\tilde{P}_X || P_X) \leq \mathsf{U}$, for some given uncertainty level $\mathsf{U} > 0$ (recall Pinsker's inequality [37, Lemma 11.6.1] and see also the discussion in [38]). A direction for future research is to derive bounds on optimal rate functions and their excess-rate performance which are robust for source uncertainty of various kinds.

In this paper, we have focused on the SW scenario in which the side information vector $\mathbf{y}$ is known exactly to the source. Similar techniques can also be applied to the more general case of SW coding, where the side information is also encoded. In this case, there are two encoders, s_n for encoding $\mathbf{x}$ and s'_n for encoding $\mathbf{y}$, while the central decoder σ_n now uses both codewords $s_n(\mathbf{x})$ and $s'_n(\mathbf{y})$. For type-dependent, variable-rate codes, two rate functions $\rho_X(Q_X)$ and $\rho_Y(Q_Y)$ may be defined accordingly. While bounds on the resulting error exponent may be derived, the trade-off in this case is more complicated. First, there are two excess-rate exponents, one for each of the decoders. Second, a trickle of coordination might be required between the two encoders in order to ensure a required error exponent.Specifically, at least one of the encoders needs to know the current rate (or equivalently, the type class of the current source block) of the other encoder.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Associate Editor, Jun Chen, for providing them the unpublished manuscript [18], and for his useful comments. Specifically, the proof of Theorem 5 follows from the proof of Theorem 2 which is a reproduction of [18, Theorem 1]. Useful comments made by the anonymous referees are also acknowledged with thanks.

APPENDIX A

Proof of Theorem 2:

Upper bound (26)*:* Follows exactly as in the proof of [18, Theorem 1].

Lower bound (27)*:* The proof of the achievable bound is also very similar to the proof of [18, Theorem 1], with a slight modification. For completeness, we provide a proof here.

For brevity, we will omit the notation of the dependence of $\overline{R}(Q_X;\mathcal{S})$ in $\mathcal{S}$ and denote it by $\overline{R}(Q_X)$. Assume that $Q_X \in \operatorname{int}\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$, and $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})$ for some minimal $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the statement in (27) is only about the conditional error exponent of the type Q_X, it is clear that the SW codes constructed, may only encode $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$, and so only block lengths $n \mod n_0 \neq 0$ should be considered, as otherwise $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ is empty, and the conditional error probability is 0, by definition.

Let $\delta > 0$ be given, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a sequence of constant composition channel codes of type $Q_X^{(n)} \to Q_X$, asymptotic rate $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_n|}{n} \geq H(Q_X) - \overline{R}(Q_X) - \frac{\delta}{2}$, which also achieves the infimum reliability function for the channel $P_{Y|X}$, i.e.

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log p_e(\mathcal{C}_n) \geq \underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \overline{R}(Q_X), Q_X, P_{Y|X}) - \delta. \tag{A.1}$$

From Lemma 26, it can be assumed w.l.o.g. that for n sufficiently large, whenever, $n \mod n_0 = 0$, the codebook satisfies $\mathcal{C}_n \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$. Now, assume that n is sufficiently large and that $n \mod n_0 \neq 0$. From the covering lemma [39, Section 6, Covering Lemma 2], one can find

$$T_n = \exp\left[n\left(\overline{R}(Q_X) + \delta\right)\right] \tag{A.2}$$

permutations $\{\pi_{n,t}\}_{t=1}^{T_n}$, such that $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X) = \bigcup_{t=1}^{T_n} \pi_{n,t}(\mathcal{C}_n)$, where $\pi_{n,t}(\mathcal{C}_n)$ means that the same permutation $\pi_{n,t}(\cdot)$ operates on codewords in the codebook. Since the channel $P_{Y|X}$ is memoryless then clearly $p_e(\pi(\mathcal{C}_n)) = p_e(\mathcal{C}_n)$ for any permutation π, since the decoder can always apply the inverse permutation on $\mathbf{y}$ and decode as if the codebook is $\mathcal{C}_n$. Let us define the following sequence of SW codes $\mathcal{S}^* = \{\mathcal{S}_n^* = (s_n^*, \sigma_n^*)\}$ from the channel codes $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_n = (f_n, \varphi_n)\}$.

- *Codebook Construction:* Generate the codebook $\mathcal{C}_n$ and enumerate the permutations $\{\pi_{n,t}\}_{t=1}^{T_n}$ such that $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X) = \bigcup_{l=1}^{T_n} \pi_{n,t}(\mathcal{C}_n)$. The above information is revealed to both the encoder and the decoder off-line.
- *Encoding:* Upon observing $\mathbf{x}$, determine its empirical distribution $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}$. If $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}} \neq Q_X$ the codeword is $s_n^*(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Else, find $t^*(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \min\{t' : \mathbf{x} \in \pi_{n,t'}(\mathcal{C}_n(Q_X))\}$. The codeword is $s_n^*(\mathbf{x}) = (1, \tau(t^*(\mathbf{x})))$ where $\tau(t)$ is the binary representation of t in $\lceil \log_2 T_n \rceil$ bits.
- *Decoding:* If $s_n^*(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ then declare an error. Else, recover from $s_n^*(\mathbf{x})$ the permutation $\pi = \pi_{n,t(\mathbf{x})}$. Find $\hat{t}(\mathbf{y}) \triangleq t^*(\pi(\varphi_n(\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))))$, and if $\hat{t}(\mathbf{y}) = t^*(\mathbf{x})$ then decode $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \pi(\varphi_n(\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{y})))$, and otherwise declare an error.

The conditional average rate of $\mathcal{S}^*$ satisfies $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[r^*(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)] = \overline{R}(Q_X) + \delta$. Since all source blocks in $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ are equiprobable, the conditional error probability satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \mathbb{P}(\sigma_n^*(s_n^*(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{Y}) \neq \mathbf{X}|\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) &\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \mathbb{P}(\varphi_n(\mathbf{Y}) \neq \mathbf{X}|\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \\ &= \underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \overline{R}(Q_X), Q_X, P_{Y|X}) - \delta, \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

where it should be emphasized that whenever $n \mod n_0 \neq 0$ then $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_n^*(s_n^*(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{Y}) \neq \mathbf{X}|\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) = 0$ by

convention. The result follows since $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary. Before concluding the proof, we make the following remark.

Remark 19. In the proof, the actual choice of the decoder was implicit since the SW codes are constructed from channel codes. However, as is well known, the optimal decoder in terms of minimum error probability is to decode $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X) \cap s_n^{-1}(s_n(\mathbf{x}))$ that maximizes $P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y})$. Since all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in s_n^{-1}(s_n(\mathbf{x}))$ are in the type class Q_X, they have the same probability $P_{\mathbf{X}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$, so this decoding rule is equivalent to maximizing $P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$, which is a *maximum likelihood* (ML) decoding rule. Nonetheless, there are cases in which other decoders, such as the minimum conditional entropy decoder, also achieve the same error exponent (see Appendix C for a precise definition). This decoder has the merit of not depending on P_{XY} and is therefore a *universal* decoder.

■

Proof of Theorem 3: Since $|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})| \leq (n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, the error probability satisfies

$$p_e(\mathcal{S}_n) = \sum_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \tag{A.4}$$

$$\doteq \max_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} e^{-nD(Q_X||P_X)} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \tag{A.5}$$

$$= \exp\left(-n \cdot \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) - \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} \right). \tag{A.6}$$

Now, for every $\epsilon > 0$, let $Q_X^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be such that

$$D\left(Q_X^*||P_X\right) + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*)) \right\} \leq$$
$$\inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} \right\} + \epsilon \tag{A.7}$$

and let m_0 be sufficiently large so that

$$\sup_{n > m_0} \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*)) \right\} \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*)) \right\} + \epsilon. \tag{A.8}$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{E}_e^+(\mathcal{S}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) - \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} \tag{A.9}$$

$$= \lim_{m\to\infty} \sup_{n \geq m} \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) - \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} \tag{A.10}$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \lim_{m\to\infty} \sup_{n \geq m} \inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) - \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} \tag{A.11}$$

$$\leq \sup_{n \geq m_0} \inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) - \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} \tag{A.12}$$

$$\leq \inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) + \sup_{n \geq m_0} \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} \right\} \tag{A.13}$$

$$\leq D\left(Q_X^*||P_X\right) + \sup_{n>m_0}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}\neq\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*))\right\} \tag{A.14}$$

$$\overset{(b)}{\leq} \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) + \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}\neq\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\}\right\} + 2\epsilon \tag{A.15}$$

$$\overset{(c)}{\leq} \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) + \overline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X) - \overline{R}(Q_X;\mathcal{S}), Q_X, P_{Y|X})\right\} + 2\epsilon \tag{A.16}$$

where (a) is because, by assumption, if $\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ is empty then $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}\neq\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) = 0$, and (b) is from (A.7) and (A.8). The inequality (c) is due to the upper bound of Theorem 2. ■

Proof of Theorem 4: The excess-rate exponent at the target rate R is

$$p_r(\mathcal{S}_n,\mathsf{R}) = \sum_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \tag{A.17}$$

$$\doteq \exp\left(-n\cdot\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X) - \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\}\right). \tag{A.18}$$

Now, let $\epsilon>0$ be given and let m_0 be sufficiently large such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X) - \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\}$$
$$\leq \inf_{n\geq m_0}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X) + \liminf_{n\to\infty}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\}\right\} + \epsilon. \tag{A.19}$$

Also, choose $Q_X^*\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$D(Q_X^*||P_X) + \liminf_{n\to\infty}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*))\right\}$$
$$\leq \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X) + \liminf_{n\to\infty}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\}\right\} + \epsilon. \tag{A.20}$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S},\mathsf{R}) = \liminf_{n\to\infty}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X) - \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\} \tag{A.21}$$

$$\overset{(a)}{\leq} \inf_{n\geq m_0}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X) - \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\} + \epsilon \tag{A.22}$$

$$\overset{(b)}{\leq} \inf_{n\geq m_0}\left\{D(Q_X^*||P_X) - \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*))\right\} + \epsilon \tag{A.23}$$

$$= D(Q_X^*||P_X) + \inf_{n\geq m_0}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*))\right\} + \epsilon \tag{A.24}$$

$$\leq \left\{D(Q_X^*||P_X) + \lim_{m\to\infty}\inf_{n\geq m} -\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^*))\right\} + \epsilon \tag{A.25}$$

$$\overset{(c)}{\leq} \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X) + \liminf_{n\to\infty}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\}\right\} + 2\epsilon$$

where (a) is due to (A.19), (b) is because there exists $l\in\mathbb{N}$ so that $l\cdot n_0 > m_0$ and then $Q_X^*\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})\subset\mathcal{P}_{l\cdot n_0}(\mathcal{X})$, and (c) is due to (A.20). As $\epsilon>0$ is arbitrary we get the desired result. ■

Proof of Theorem 5: We will use the following two lemmas:

Lemma 20. *Let $Q_X, Q'_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and assume that*[10] $||Q_X - Q'_X|| = \frac{2d^*}{n}$ *where $d^* > 0$. If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ then*

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q'_X)} d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \leq d^*. \tag{A.26}$$

Proof of Lemma 20: We prove this Lemma by modifying the vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ into a vector $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q'_X)$ by less than d^* letter substitutions. Clearly, for some letters $x_1^-, x_1^+ \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $Q_X(x_1^-) < Q'_X(x_1^-)$ and $Q_X(x_1^+) > Q'_X(x_1^+)$. Find an index i_1 such that the ith entry of $\mathbf{x}$ is x_1^+ and change it to x_1^-. Denote the resulting vector by $\mathbf{x}_1$, and let its type by $Q_X^{(1)}$. If, $Q_X^{(1)} = Q'_X$ then we have found a vector $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q'_X)$ such that $d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \leq 1 \leq d^*$ and thus we are done. Otherwise, we have

$$||Q'_X - Q_X^{(1)}|| = \frac{2(d^* - 1)}{n}. \tag{A.27}$$

In this case, repeat the same steps for $\mathbf{x}_1$, and at each step, the variation distance between Q'_X and $Q_X^{(k)}$ decreases by $\frac{2}{n}$. Thus, after at most d^* stages, a vector $\mathbf{x}^{(d^*)} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q'_X)$ is found, such that $d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \leq d^*$. ■

Lemma 21. *Let $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$. For $1 \leq k < n$ we have*

$$||\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}(1:n-k)}|| < |\mathcal{X}| \cdot \frac{k}{n-k}. \tag{A.28}$$

Proof of Lemma 21: For any given letter $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we denote $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(x) = \frac{m}{n}$, and analyze

$$|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(x) - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}(1:n-k)}(x)|. \tag{A.29}$$

The largest difference possible is either when $\mathbf{x}(i) = x$ for $\min\{k, m\}$ letters out of $n-k+1 \leq i \leq n$ or $\mathbf{x}(i) \neq x$ for all $n-k+1 \leq i \leq n$. In the former case, when $m \geq k$, then

$$|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(x) - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}(1:n-k)}(x)| = \left| \frac{m}{n} - \frac{m-k}{n-k} \right| = \frac{m}{n} - \frac{m-k}{n-k} \tag{A.30}$$

$$< \frac{m}{n} - \frac{m-k}{n} < \frac{k}{n-k} \tag{A.31}$$

and when $m < k$ then

$$|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(x) - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}(1:n-k)}(x)| = \left| \frac{m}{n} - \frac{0}{n-k} \right| = \frac{m}{n} \tag{A.32}$$

$$< \frac{k}{n} < \frac{k}{n-k}. \tag{A.33}$$

In the later case

$$|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(x) - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}(1:n-k)}(x)| = \left| \frac{m}{n} - \frac{m}{n-k} \right| = \frac{m}{n-k} - \frac{m}{n} \tag{A.34}$$

[10]For two different types in $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, the minimal variation distance is $\frac{2}{n}$.

$$\leq \frac{m}{n-k} - \frac{m-k}{n-k} = \frac{k}{n-k}. \tag{A.35}$$

The result follows by summing over $x \in \mathcal{X}$. ■

We can now prove Theorem 5. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given, and find n_0 sufficiently large such that for any $Q'_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ there exists $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $||Q_X - Q'_X|| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. For a given pair of vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}^n$, define the binary vector $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}'} \in \{0,1\}^n$ where

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}'}(i) = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbf{x}(i) \neq \mathbf{x}'(i) \\ 0, & \mathbf{x}(i) = \mathbf{x}'(i) \end{cases} \tag{A.36}$$

and also define $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}'} = \{i : \mathbf{x}(i) \neq \mathbf{x}'(i)\}$. Also let $n_1 = n_0\epsilon + 2n_0|\mathcal{X}|$. We construct the following SW codes $\mathcal{S}$ for all $n > \max\{n_0, n_1\}$:

- *Codebook Construction:*
  - Compute $k^*(n) \triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{n_0} \right\rfloor$.
  - Assign a binary string $\tau_1(Q_X)$ for each type in $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$.
  - Assign a binary string $\tau_2(a)$ for each letter $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^m$, define

$$\tau_2(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq (\tau_2(\mathbf{x}(1)), \ldots, \tau_2(\mathbf{x}(m))). \tag{A.37}$$

  - Assign a binary string $\tau_3(\mathbf{b})$ for each binary vector $\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}) \leq \lceil \frac{n\epsilon}{2} \rceil$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is the all-zero vector of length n.
  - Construct the SW codes $\mathcal{S}^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}(Q_X) = (s^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0, Q_X}, \sigma^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0, Q_X})$ of rate $\rho(Q_X)$ as in Theorem 2, for all $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$.
  - For any given $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ find

$$\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X) \triangleq \underset{Q'_X \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})}{\arg\min} ||Q_X - Q'_X||. \tag{A.38}$$

  The above information is revealed to both the encoder and the decoder off-line.

- *Encoding:* Upon observing $\mathbf{x}$, determine its empirical distribution $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and find

$$\mathbf{w} = \underset{\overline{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{T}_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}(\Phi_\epsilon(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}))}{\arg\min} d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{x}(1 : k^*(n) \cdot n_0), \overline{\mathbf{w}}). \tag{A.39}$$

  Let $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}(1 : k^*(n) \cdot n_0)$, and encode the source block $\mathbf{x}$ as:

$$s_n(\mathbf{x}) = (\tau_1(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}), \tau_2(\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}), \tau_2(\mathbf{x}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}})), \tau_3(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}), \tau_2(\mathbf{x}(k^*(n) \cdot n_0 + 1 : n)), s^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0, Q_X}(\mathbf{w})). \tag{A.40}$$

- *Decoding:* Upon observing $\mathbf{y}$ and $s_n(\mathbf{x})$:
  - From $s_n(\mathbf{x})$, recover $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and determine $\Phi_\epsilon(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})$. Recover $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}$, $\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}})$,$\mathbf{x}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}})$, and $\mathbf{x}(k^*(n)\cdot n_0 + 1 : n)$.

– Generate a vector $\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}^{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}$ as follows: For any index $1 \leq i \leq k^*(n)\cdot n_0$. If $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}(i) = 0$ then set $\mathbf{y}'(i) = \mathbf{y}(i)$. Otherwise, draw $\mathbf{y}'(i)$ according to the conditional distribution $P_{Y|X}(\cdot|\mathbf{w}(i))$.

– Decode

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \sigma^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0, \Phi_\epsilon(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})}\left(s^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0, \Phi_\epsilon(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})}(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{y}'\right). \tag{A.41}$$

– The decoded source block is

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}(i) = \begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{w}}(i), & 1 \leq i \leq k^*(n)\cdot n_0,\ \Delta_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}(i) = 0 \\ \mathbf{x}(i), & 1 \leq i \leq k^*(n)\cdot n_0,\ \Delta_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}(i) = 1 \\ \mathbf{x}(i), & k^*(n)\cdot n_0 + 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases} \tag{A.42}$$

To prove that such coding is possible, notice that from Lemma 21 and the fact that $n > n_1$, we have

$$||\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}'} - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}|| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \tag{A.43}$$

and by the triangle inequality

$$||\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}'} - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}|| \leq ||\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}'} - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}|| + ||\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}|| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \tag{A.44}$$

Thus, Lemma 20 implies that

$$d_{\mathrm{H}}(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{0}) = d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{w}) \leq \left\lceil \frac{n\epsilon}{2} \right\rceil. \tag{A.45}$$

Let us now analyze the resulting asymptotic error probability of $\mathcal{S}$. For any given $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_e^-(\mathcal{S}) &\overset{(a)}{=} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) - \frac{1}{n}\log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{X}} \neq \mathbf{X}|\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)) \right\} && \text{(A.46)} \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \Bigg\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) + \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{n}\log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{W}} \neq \mathbf{W}|\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{T}_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))) \Bigg\} && \text{(A.47)} \\
&= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \Bigg\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) + \\
&\quad -\frac{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}{n}\frac{1}{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}\log \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{W}} \neq \mathbf{W}|\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{T}_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))) \Bigg\} && \text{(A.48)} \\
&\overset{(c)}{\geq} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \Bigg\{ D\left(Q_X||P_X\right) + \\
&\quad \underline{E}_e^*(H(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)) - \rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)), \Phi_\epsilon(Q_X), P_{Y|X}) - \delta \Bigg\} && \text{(A.49)} \\
&\overset{(d)}{\geq} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})} \Bigg\{ D\left(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)||P_X\right) +
\end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{E}_e^*(H(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))-\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)),\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X),P_{Y|X})-\delta-\delta_1\Bigg\} \tag{A.50}$$

$$= \liminf_{n\to\infty}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})}\Bigg\{D\left(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)||P_X\right)+$$

$$\underline{E}_e^*(H(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))-\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)),\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X),P_{Y|X})-\delta-\delta_1\Bigg\} \tag{A.51}$$

$$= \liminf_{n\to\infty}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})}\Bigg\{D\left(Q_X||P_X\right)+\underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X)-\rho(Q_X),Q_X,P_{Y|X})-\delta-\delta_1\Bigg\} \tag{A.52}$$

$$= \min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})}\Bigg\{D\left(Q_X||P_X\right)+\underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X)-\rho(Q_X),Q_X,P_{Y|X})-\delta-\delta_1\Bigg\} \tag{A.53}$$

$$\geq \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})}\Bigg\{D\left(Q_X||P_X\right)+\underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X)-\rho(Q_X),Q_X,P_{Y|X})-\delta-\delta_1\Bigg\} \tag{A.54}$$

where the passages are explained as follows:

- Equality (a) is as in (A.4)-(A.6). Notice that the error event $\{\hat{\mathbf{X}}\neq\mathbf{X}\}$ in this equation is for the code $\mathcal{S}_n$.
- Equality (b) is because an error $\hat{\mathbf{x}}\neq\mathbf{x}$ occurs only when the decoder $\sigma^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0,\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)}$ makes an error, since the vector $\mathbf{v}$ is generated memorylessly according to $P_{Y|X}$, conditioned on $\mathbf{w}$. Notice that the error event $\{\hat{\mathbf{W}}\neq\mathbf{W}\}$ in this equation and the following is for the code $\mathcal{S}^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))$.
- Inequality (c) is because there exists n_2 sufficiently large, such that for all $n>n_2$ the error probability of the decoder $\sigma^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0,\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)}$ satisfies

$$-\frac{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}{n}\frac{1}{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}\log\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}\neq\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{W}\in\mathcal{T}_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)))$$
$$\geq \underline{E}_e^*(H(Q_X)-\rho(Q_X),Q_X,P_{Y|X})-\delta$$

  uniformly for all $Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(Q_X)$ (notice also that $\frac{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}{n}\to 1$ as $n\to\infty$).
- Inequality (d) is because $D(Q_X||P_X)$ is a continuous function of Q_X in $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$ (as $\mathrm{supp}(P_X)=\mathcal{X}$), and thus uniformly continuous, and where $\delta_1>0$ and $\delta_1\downarrow 0$ as $\epsilon\downarrow 0$.

Regarding the rate, observe that the resulting codes of $\mathcal{S}$ are type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes, since $\mathcal{S}^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}(Q_X)$ are such. Let us analyze the total rate required to encode $\mathbf{x}\in Q_X$:

- Since $|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})|\leq(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ then for n sufficiently large.

$$\frac{1}{n}|\tau_1(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})|\leq\frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{n}\cdot\log(n+1)\leq\delta \tag{A.55}$$

- Encoding of all possible binary vectors $\mathbf{b}\in\{0,1\}^{n-k^*(n)n_0}$ such that $d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{b})\leq\lceil\frac{n\epsilon}{2}\rceil$ requires a rate of [37, Chapter 13.2]

$$\frac{1}{n}|\tau_3(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}})|\leq h_B\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)+\delta \tag{A.56}$$

  for n sufficiently large.

- Encoding the components of $\mathbf{x}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}})$ and $\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}})$ letter-wise with zero error, requires a rate

$$\frac{1}{n}|\tau_2(\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}))|+\frac{1}{n}|\tau_2(\mathbf{x}'(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}}))|\leq 2\cdot\frac{\epsilon}{2}\log|\mathcal{X}|+\frac{2}{n}\leq\epsilon\log|\mathcal{X}|+\delta \tag{A.57}$$

  for n sufficiently large.

- Encoding the components of $\mathbf{x}(k^*(n)\cdot n_0+1:n)$ letter-wise with zero error, requires a rate of

$$\frac{1}{n}|\tau_2(\mathbf{x}(k^*(n)\cdot n_0+1:n))|\leq\left(\frac{n-k^*(n)n_0}{n}\right)\cdot\log|\mathcal{X}|\leq\delta \tag{A.58}$$

  for n sufficiently large.

- By construction, $\mathcal{S}^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0,\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)}$ is a type-dependent, variable-rate SW code of rate $\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))$ and thus for sufficiently large n

$$\frac{1}{n}\left|s^*_{k^*(n)\cdot n_0,\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)}(\mathbf{w})\right|\leq\frac{k^*(n)\cdot n_0}{n}\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))+\delta \tag{A.59}$$

  uniformly over Q_X.

Thus, for sufficiently large n, the resulting total rate for coding $\mathbf{x}\in Q_X$ is less than $\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))+\varrho$ where

$$\varrho=h_B\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)+\epsilon\log|\mathcal{X}|+5\delta. \tag{A.60}$$

The resulting excess-rate exponent is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{S},\mathsf{R}+\varrho) &\overset{(a)}{=} \liminf_{n\to\infty}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X)-\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(r(\mathbf{X})\geq\mathsf{R}+\varrho|\mathbf{X}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X))\right\}\\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \liminf_{n\to\infty}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})\colon\,\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))\geq\mathsf{R}}D(Q_X||P_X) &\text{(A.61)}\\
&\overset{(c)}{\geq} \liminf_{n\to\infty}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})\colon\,\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))\geq\mathsf{R}}D(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)||P_X)-\delta_1 &\text{(A.62)}\\
&= \liminf_{n\to\infty}\min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})\colon\,\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))\geq\mathsf{R}}D(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X)||P_X)-\delta_1 &\text{(A.63)}\\
&= \min_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})\colon\,\rho(Q_X)\geq\mathsf{R}}D(Q_X||P_X)-\delta_1 &\text{(A.64)}\\
&\geq \inf_{Q_X\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})\colon\,\rho(Q_X)\geq\mathsf{R}}D(Q_X||P_X)-\delta_1 &\text{(A.65)}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is as in (A.17)-(A.18), (b) is because the codes $\mathcal{S}_n$ are type-dependent, variable-rate codes which assign rate $\rho(\Phi_\epsilon(Q_X))+\varrho$ to the type Q_X, and (c) is again by the uniform continuity of $D(Q_X||P_X)$ in $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$. We obtain the desired result by taking $\delta\downarrow 0$ and then $\epsilon\downarrow 0$.

Before completing the proof, we make the following two remarks.

Remark 22. The vector actually coded is $\mathbf{w}$ (A.39), not the original source block $\mathbf{x}$. Thus, after modifying $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{w}$, the distribution of $\mathbf{w}$ may not be uniform within its type class (even when conditioned on the event that $\mathbf{x}$ belongs to some type class), which might affect (A.47). There are two possibilities to circumvent this[11]. The first is to use common randomness at the encoder and decoder, and to generate a uniformly random permutation. Prior to

[11]This matter was not addressed in the body of the proof in order not to over-complicate it.

encoding, the source block $\mathbf{x}$ is permuted, and the decoder simply applies the inverse permutation after decoding. In this case, the uniform distribution of $\mathbf{w}$ is assured. The second possibility is to construct the SW codes from channel codes (as was done in Theorem 2) which have maximal error probability according to the reliability function (see (A.1)), and not just the average error probability. As is well known, such a channel code can be generated from a good average error probability codebook, by simply expurgating the worst half of the codebook. The rate loss is negligible, and here too, good error probability is assured uniformly over $\mathbf{w}$ in the type class.

Remark 23. In the proof above, the actual decoders σ^*_{n,Q_X} of $\mathcal{S}^*_n(Q_X)$ were not specified, and any decoder which achieves the error exponent for the underlying channel code can be used. Thus, in the proof of 5, a randomized decoder was required, in order to mimic the channel operation $P_{Y|X}$ for the vector $\mathbf{w}$. However, this might not be required if σ^*_{n,Q_X} is more specific. For example, if the decoder σ^*_{n,Q_X} is the ML decoder, then instead of drawing $\mathbf{y}'(i)$ according to the conditional distribution $P_{Y|X}(\cdot|\mathbf{w}(i))$, it can be simply set to the letter with maximal likelihood, i.e., $\mathbf{y}'(i) = \arg\max_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} P_{Y|X}(y|\mathbf{w}(i))$. This only improves the error probability, and thus the results of Theorem 5 remain valid.

■

Proof of Theorem 10: The proof is divided into three parts, one for each of the bounds.

Random binning bound: From Theorem 5, we may clearly assume that $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \le H(Q_X)$, as otherwise the random coding bound in (17) is infinite, and E_e is trivially achieved. Now, from the random coding bound in (17), the condition in (36) will be satisfied for a rate function $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ which satisfies

$$\mathsf{E}_e \le D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{Y|X}} D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) + \left[\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+ . \tag{A.66}$$

Clearly, if $\mathsf{E}_e \le D(Q_X||P_X)$, no actual constraint is imposed on the rate, and (A.66) is satisfied even for $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = 0$. Otherwise, (A.66) is equivalent to

$$\mathsf{E}_e \le D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \max_{0\le\lambda\le 1} D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) + \lambda\left[\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right] \tag{A.67}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) &\ge \max_{Q_{Y|X}} \min_{0\le\lambda\le 1} \left[\frac{\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_{XY}||P_{XY})}{\lambda} + H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right] &\text{(A.68)}\\ &= \max_{Q_{Y|X}\in\mathcal{A}} \left[\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) + H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right] &\text{(A.69)} \end{aligned}$$

which directly leads to the second term in (51). For the third term in (51), let us notice that for $\mathsf{E}_e \ge D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q'_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)$ we have that $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ is affine with slope 1. Indeed, using (51) we get for $\mathsf{E}_e > D(Q_X||P_X)$

$$\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \ge \mathsf{E}_e + H(Q_X) \tag{A.70}$$

$$-D(Q_X||P_X) - \Big\{I(Q_X \times Q'_{Y|X}) + D(Q'_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)\Big\}$$

and for $\mathsf{E}_e \geq D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q'_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)$ equality is achieved since $Q'_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{rb}}$. For the fourth term in (51), notice that the minimal E_e such that $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = H(Q_X)$ is given by

$$\mathsf{E}_e = D(Q_X||P_X) + I(Q_X \times Q'_{Y|X}) + D(Q'_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X). \tag{A.71}$$

Expurgated bound: From Theorem 5, we may clearly assume that $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \leq H(Q_X)$, as otherwise the expurgated bound in (18) is infinite, and E_e is trivially achieved. Now, from the expurgated bound in (18), the condition in (36) will be satisfied for a rate function $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ which satisfies

$$\mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X, \rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X,\mathsf{E}_e)\leq H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}})} \Big\{B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) + \rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) - H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}})\Big\}. \tag{A.72}$$

Clearly, if $\mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X)$ then $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = 0$. Now, (A.72) is equivalent to

$$\mathsf{E}_e \;\leq\; D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X} \max_{\lambda\geq 0}\Big\{B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) + (1+\lambda)\Big[\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) - H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}})\Big]\Big\}$$

or equivalently,

$$\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \geq \max_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X} \min_{\lambda\geq 0} \frac{\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})}{1+\lambda} + H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) = \max\{v_1, v_2\} \tag{A.73}$$

where

$$v_1 \triangleq \max_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)\leq B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})} \min_{\lambda\geq 0} \frac{\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})}{1+\lambda} + H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \tag{A.74}$$

$$= \max_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)\leq B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})} \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) + H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}), \tag{A.75}$$

and

$$v_2 \triangleq \max_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)\geq B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})} \min_{\lambda\geq 0} \frac{\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})}{1+\lambda} + H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \tag{A.76}$$

$$= \max_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)\geq B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})} H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \tag{A.77}$$

and in both the maximization problems of v_1 and v_2, the constraint $Q_X = (Q_X \times Q_{\tilde{X}|X})_{\tilde{X}}$ is also imposed. Notice that the maximizer of $H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}})$ under the constraint $Q_{\tilde{X}} = Q_X$, is given by $Q_{X\tilde{X}} = Q_X \times Q_{\tilde{X}} = Q_X \times Q_X$. We now have two cases, depending whether $\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_X \times Q_X, P_{Y|X}) \leq 0$ or $\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_X \times Q_X, P_{Y|X}) > 0$. In the first case, $\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_X \times Q_X, P_{Y|X}) \leq 0$ and then the solution of v_2 must be on the boundary of the constraint set (as this optimization problem is concave), i.e.

$$v_2 = \max_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}\colon Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X,\, \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X})=0} H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \leq v_1 \tag{A.78}$$

So, for this case

$$\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = \mathsf{E}_e + H(Q_X) - D(Q_X||P_X) \\ - \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}:\, Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X,\, \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) \le 0} \left\{ B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) + I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) \right\}. \quad \text{(A.79)}$$

Now, for $\mathsf{E}_e \le \mathsf{E}_{e,\text{a-ex}}$ we have

$$\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \ge \mathsf{E}_e + H(Q_X) - D(Q_X||P_X) - \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}:\, Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X} \left\{ B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) + I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) \right\} \quad \text{(A.80)}$$

and for $\mathsf{E}_e \le D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_X \times Q'_{\tilde{X}|X}, P_{Y|X})$ equality is achieved since $Q'_{\tilde{X}|X} \in\in \mathcal{A}_{\text{ex}}$. Thus, the second term in (52) follows. For the third term, we must have that the constraint in (A.79) is satisfied with an equality. In the second case, $\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - B(Q_X \times Q_X, P_{Y|X}) \ge 0$ and then $v_2 \ge v_1$ and the fourth term in (52) is obtained.

Sphere packing bound: From Theorem 3, we may clearly assume that $\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \le H(Q_X)$, as otherwise the sphere packing bound in (21) is infinite, and the upper bound on the error exponent is trivial. From Theorem 3 and the sphere packing bound in (21), the condition in (36) will be not be satisfied unless that rate function $\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ satisfies

$$\mathsf{E}_e \le D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{Y|X}:\, \rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \le H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)} D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X). \quad \text{(A.81)}$$

Clearly, if $\mathsf{E}_e \le D(Q_X||P_X)$ then $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = 0$. Otherwise,

$$\mathsf{E}_e \le D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \max_{\lambda \ge 0} D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) + \lambda \left(\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y) \right) \quad \text{(A.82)}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) &\ge \max_{Q_{Y|X}} \min_{\lambda \ge 0} \frac{\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) - D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)}{\lambda} + H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y) \\ &= \max_{Q_{Y|X}:\, D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \le \mathsf{E}_e} H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y) \end{aligned}$$

which directly leads to the second term in (53). For the third term in (53), let us find the minimal E_e such that $\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = H(Q_X)$, or equivalently

$$\min_{Q_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{A}} I(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}) = 0. \quad \text{(A.83)}$$

Obviously, for minimal E_e with this property, the inequality in $\mathcal{A}$ must be achieved with an equality, and so

$$\min_{D(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}||P_{XY}) = \mathsf{E}_e} I(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}) = 0. \quad \text{(A.84)}$$

Thus, using Lemma 34, the minimal E_e is given by

$$\min_{Q_Y} D(Q_X \times Q_Y||P_{XY}) = D(Q_X \times (Q_X \times P_{Y|X})_Y||P_{XY}). \quad \text{(A.85)}$$

■

Proof of Lemma 11: Most of the properties can be immediately obtained, and so we only provide the less trivial proofs.

- *Positivity:* For $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$, observe that if $\mathsf{E}_e > D(Q_X||P_X)$ then to satisfy (A.66) for $Q_{Y|X} = P_{Y|X}$, we must have $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) > H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)$, where here $Q_{X|Y}$ is induced from $Q_X \times P_{Y|X}$. If $H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y) > 0$ then we are done. Else, slightly alter $Q_{Y|X}$ from $P_{Y|X}$ such that $D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) < \mathsf{E}_e$ but $H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y) > 0$. For $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$, observe that if $\mathsf{E}_e > D(Q_X||P_X)$ then

$$\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = H(Q_X) - \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{ex}}} I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) \tag{A.86}$$

  and $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = 0$ iff $I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) = H(Q_X)$, namely, the channel $Q_{\tilde{X}|X}$ is noiseless, $X = \tilde{X}$ with probability 1. However, for this channel $B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) = 0 < \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)$, and so the constraint $Q_{\tilde{X}|X} \in \mathcal{A}$ is not satisfied. Thus, $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) > 0$.
- *Monotonicity:* For $\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$, notice that from (52), we have

$$\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = H(Q_X) - \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X} \in \mathcal{A}} I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}). \tag{A.87}$$

  Now, since $I(Q_{X\tilde{X}})$ is a convex function of $Q_{\tilde{X}|X}$ and its minimizer $Q_X \times Q_X$ is outside the set

$$\mathcal{A}' \triangleq \left\{ Q_{\tilde{X}|X} : Q_{\tilde{X}} = Q_X,\ \mathsf{E}_e \geq D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) \right\} \tag{A.88}$$

  then we also have

$$\rho_{\text{ex}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = H(Q_X) - \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X} \in \mathcal{A}'} I(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) \tag{A.89}$$

  and the solution is always on the boundary. Since the set $\mathcal{A}'$ is strictly increasing as a function of E_e, the result follows.
- *Concavity:* Can be verified using Lemma 31 (Appendix E).
- *Regularity:* Obtained by letting $\mathcal{V} = \{Q_X : D(Q_X||P_X) < \mathsf{E}_e\}$.

■

Proof of Lemma 12: This can be proved if we show that the infimum of $\inf_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$ is attained, and that the function $\min_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$ is left-continuous in R. We begin by showing that the infimum of $\inf_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$ is attained. Recall that $\rho(Q_X)$ is regular, and so there exists a $d > 0$ such that $\rho(Q_X)$ is continuous in $\mathcal{V} = \{Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) : D(Q_X||P_X) < d\}$, and equals a constant $\rho(Q_X) = \mathsf{R}_0$, for $Q_X \in \mathcal{V}^c$. Thus,

$$\inf_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X) = \min \left\{ \inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V} : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X), \min_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}^c : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X) \right\} \tag{A.90}$$

and so, if $\inf_{Q_X : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$ is not attained, then the infimum of $\inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V} : \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$ is not

attained for some $Q_X \in \mathcal{V}$, and so

$$\inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}: \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X) = d. \tag{A.91}$$

However, in this case, there also must exist a sequence $\overline{Q}_X^{(n)} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\rho(\overline{Q}_X^{(n)}) \to \mathsf{R}$ and $\rho(\overline{Q}_X^{(n)}) > \mathsf{R}$. But since $D(\overline{Q}_X^{(n)}||P_X) < d$ this is a contradiction that $d = \inf_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}: \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$.

Now, to show left continuity of $\min_{Q_X: \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$ as a function of R, let $\delta > 0$ be given. For any $\epsilon > 0$ we clearly have

$$\min_{Q_X: \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}-\epsilon} D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \min_{Q_X: \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X) = D(Q_X^*||P_X). \tag{A.92}$$

To obtain the reversed inequality, we divide the proof into two cases, depending on whether $Q_X^* \in \mathcal{V}$ or not.

Case 1: $Q_X^* \in \mathcal{V}$. Recall that $\rho(Q_X)$ is continuous and finite inside the interior of $\mathcal{V}$, and $D(Q_X||P_X)$ is a continuous function of Q_X. Now, we may define for any $Q_X \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}$, the closed neighborhood

$$\mathcal{D}(Q_X, \mathsf{R}, \delta) \triangleq \Big\{\tilde{Q}_X : D(\tilde{Q}_X||P_X) \geq D(Q_X||P_X) - \delta\Big\} \cap \overline{\mathcal{V}}. \tag{A.93}$$

Also, we may define the set

$$\mathcal{V}'(\mathsf{R}) \triangleq \left\{Q_X \in \partial\mathcal{V} : \lim_{\tilde{Q}_X \to Q_X} \rho(\tilde{Q}_X) = \mathsf{R}\right\} \tag{A.94}$$

where $\partial\mathcal{V} = \overline{\mathcal{V}} \backslash \mathcal{V}$ is the boundary of $\mathcal{V}$, and for any $Q_X \in \mathcal{V}'(\mathsf{R})$

$$\mathcal{D}'(Q_X, \mathsf{R}, \delta) \triangleq \{Q_X\} \cup \mathcal{D}(Q_X, \mathsf{R}, \delta). \tag{A.95}$$

Now, consider the set

$$\mathcal{U} \triangleq \mathcal{V} \backslash \left\{ \left\{ \bigcup_{\{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}'(\mathsf{R})\}} \mathcal{D}'(Q_X, \mathsf{R}, \delta) \right\} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{\{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}: \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}\}} \mathcal{D}(Q_X, \mathsf{R}, \delta) \right\} \right\} \tag{A.96}$$

and let $\mathsf{R}' \triangleq \sup_{Q_X \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}} \rho(Q_X)$. Then we must have $\mathsf{R}' < \mathsf{R}$. To see this, assume conversely, that $\mathsf{R}' = \mathsf{R}$ and let $\overline{Q}_X$ achieve the maximum, namely, $\rho(\overline{Q}_X) = \mathsf{R}$. Now, either $\overline{Q}_X \in \mathcal{V}$ or the supremum is not attained, but both cases lead to contradiction. Indeed, if the supremum is attained at some $\overline{Q}_X \in \mathcal{V}$ then $\mathcal{D}(\overline{Q}_X, \mathsf{R}, \delta) \notin \mathcal{U}$ and so $\overline{Q}_X \notin \mathcal{U}$ which is a contradiction. Otherwise, there exists a sequence $\overline{Q}_X^{(n)} \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $\rho(\overline{Q}_X^{(n)}) \to \mathsf{R}$. Assume that an arbitrary convergent sub-sequence of $\overline{Q}_X^{(n)}$ converges to $\overline{Q}_X \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}$. But, the definition of $\mathcal{D}'(Q_X, \mathsf{R}, \delta)$ and the continuity of $D(Q_X||P_X)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$ imply that for any sufficiently large n we must have $\overline{Q}_X^{(n)} \notin \overline{\mathcal{U}}$, which is a contradiction. Now, consider two sub-cases:

1) $\mathsf{R} > \mathsf{R}_0$. If we choose $\epsilon \leq \min\{\mathsf{R} - \mathsf{R}', \mathsf{R} - \mathsf{R}_0\}$ we have

$$\min_{Q_X: \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}-\epsilon} D(Q_X||P_X) \geq \min_{\mathcal{V} \backslash \mathcal{U}} D(\tilde{Q}_X||P_X) \geq D(Q_X^*||P_X) - \delta \tag{A.97}$$

since the left most minimization is over a smaller set.

2) $\mathsf{R} \leq \mathsf{R}_0$. Since Q_X^* is the minimizer for the right hand side of (56) then

$$\min_{\tilde{Q}_X \in \mathcal{V}^c} D(\tilde{Q}_X||P_X) \geq D(Q_X^*||P_X) \tag{A.98}$$

and if we choose $\epsilon \leq \mathsf{R} - \mathsf{R}'$ we also have

$$\min_{Q_X:\rho(Q_X)\geq \mathsf{R}-\epsilon} D(Q_X||P_X) \geq \min_{\tilde{Q}_X \in \mathcal{V}^c \cup \mathcal{V}\setminus\mathcal{U}} D(\tilde{Q}_X||P_X) \geq D(Q_X^*||P_X) - \delta. \tag{A.99}$$

Case 2: $Q_X^* \in \mathcal{V}^c$. In this case we clearly have $\mathsf{R}_0 \geq \mathsf{R}$ and

$$\inf_{Q_X:\rho(Q_X)\geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X) = d. \tag{A.100}$$

Now, if we let $\overline{\mathsf{R}} \triangleq \sup_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}} \rho(Q_X)$, then either this supremum is not attained or $\overline{\mathsf{R}} < \mathsf{R}$. To see this, assume conversely, that the supremum is attained by some $\overline{Q}_X \in \mathcal{V}$ and also $\overline{\mathsf{R}} \geq \mathsf{R}$. Then this implies

$$\inf_{Q_X:\rho(Q_X)\geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X) \leq D(\overline{Q}_X||P_X) \leq d \tag{A.101}$$

which is a contradiction. Now, we have two sub-cases:

1) If $\overline{\mathsf{R}} < \mathsf{R}$, we can choose $\epsilon = \mathsf{R} - \overline{\mathsf{R}} > 0$ and obtain

$$\min_{Q_X:\rho(Q_X)\geq \mathsf{R}-\epsilon} D(Q_X||P_X) \geq D(Q_X^*||P_X). \tag{A.102}$$

2) Otherwise, suppose that $\sup_{Q_X \in \mathcal{V}} \rho(Q_X)$ is not attained and $\overline{\mathsf{R}} \geq \mathsf{R}$. If $\overline{\mathsf{R}} > \mathsf{R}$ then there exists a sequence $\overline{Q}_X^{(n)} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\rho(\overline{Q}_X^{(n)}) \to \overline{\mathsf{R}}$, and so there exists n_0 such that $\rho(\overline{Q}_X^{(n)}) > \overline{\mathsf{R}}$ which contradicts the optimality of Q_X^*, and so we must have $\overline{\mathsf{R}} = \mathsf{R}$. In this case, $\rho(Q_X) < \overline{\mathsf{R}}$ for all $Q_X \in \mathcal{V}$, so define

$$\mathcal{W} \triangleq \{Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) : D(Q_X||P_X) \leq d - \delta\} \tag{A.103}$$

and let $\mathsf{R}' \triangleq \max_{Q_X \in \mathcal{W}} \rho(Q_X)$, where clearly $\mathsf{R}' < \mathsf{R}$. Then, for $\epsilon = \mathsf{R} - \mathsf{R}' > 0$

$$\min_{Q_X:\rho(Q_X)\geq \mathsf{R}-\epsilon} D(Q_X||P_X) \geq d - \delta = D(Q_X^*||P_X) - \delta. \tag{A.104}$$

To conclude, in both cases, for any given $\delta > 0$ we can find $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\min_{Q_X:\rho(Q_X)\geq \mathsf{R}-\epsilon} D(Q_X||P_X) \geq D(Q_X^*||P_X) - \delta. \tag{A.105}$$

This means that $\min_{Q_X:\rho(Q_X)\geq \mathsf{R}} D(Q_X||P_X)$ is left-continuous as a function of R, and the desired result is obtained.

■

Proof of Lemma 13:

- *Zero value domain:* This follows directly from Theorem 4.
- *Infinite value domain:* This follows directly from the excess-rate exponent bound of Theorem 5.
- *Monotonicity:* The first statement follows directly from the definition (9). When $\rho(Q_X)$ is regular, we may use

(56). Now, let Q_X^* be any minimizer of (56), for a given $\mathsf{R} < \mathsf{R}'_{\max}$. We begin by showing that $\rho(Q_X^*) = \mathsf{R}$. Assume conversely, that $\rho(Q_X^*) > \mathsf{R}$. Since $\mathsf{R} < \mathsf{R}'_{\max}$ then the same arguments that were used in the proof of Lemma 12 show that $Q_X^* \in \mathcal{V}$. Now, consider

$$Q_{\alpha,X} = (1-\alpha)P_X + \alpha Q_X^*. \tag{A.106}$$

Since $\rho(Q_X)$ is continuous in $\mathcal{V}$, then the intermediate value theorem implies that $\alpha < 1$ must exist such that $\rho(Q_{\alpha,X}) = \mathsf{R}$. Using Lemma 30, we have that $D(Q_{\alpha,X}||P_X) < D(Q_X^*||P_X)$ which contradicts the fact that Q_X^* is a minimizer of (56). Now, let $\mathcal{M}(\mathsf{R})$ be the collection of all minimizers of (56), such that for all $Q_X \notin \mathcal{M}(\mathsf{R})$ we have either $D(Q_X||P_X) > D(Q_X^*||P_X)$ or $\rho(Q_X) < \mathsf{R}$. Thus, for any $\mathsf{R}_1 > \mathsf{R}$ we have

$$\min_{Q_X:\, \rho(Q_X) \geq \mathsf{R}_1} D(Q_X||P_X) > D(Q_X^*||P_X). \tag{A.107}$$

- *Continuity:* The first statement follows from the fact that monotonic functions are continuous except for a countable number of points (Froda's theorem). The proof of the second is a part of the proof of Lemma 12.

■

Proof of Theorem 15: For any given $(\mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ we may use the condition of Lemma 14. Notice that $\hat{\rho}(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ is a regular rate function, and so the excess-rate exponent in Lemma 12 is applicable. The proof is divided into three parts, one for each of the bounds.

Random binning bound: From Theorem 5 and the random coding bound in (17), the rate function $\rho(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ will achieve infimum error exponent E_e if

$$\mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \Big\{ D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) + \big[\rho(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r) - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\big]_+ \Big\} \tag{A.108}$$

for all Q_X. Now, choosing R_0 sufficiently large, this condition will be satisfied for any Q_X which satisfies $D(Q_X||P_X) > \mathsf{E}_r$, and then the resulting condition is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{E}_e &\leq \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) + \big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\big]_+ \Big\} && \text{(A.109)} \\
&= \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \\
&\quad + t\big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\big] \Big\} && \text{(A.110)} \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \\
&\quad + t\big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\big] \Big\} && \text{(A.111)}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is because the minimization problem in (A.110) is convex in Q_X (over the convex set $\{Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) : D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_r\}$) and $\{Q_{Y|X}\}$, and the maximization problem is linear in t (over the convex set $[0,1]$), and thus also concave. Therefore, we can interchange the maximization and minimization [40] order, and obtain the condition $\max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} e_{\mathsf{rb}}(t) \geq \mathsf{E}_e$.

Expurgated bound: From Theorem 5 and the expurgated bound in (18), the rate function $\rho(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ will achieve infimum error exponent E_e if

$$\mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}:\, Q_{\tilde{X}}=Q_X, \rho(Q_X;\mathsf{R},\mathsf{E}_r)\leq H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}})} \Big\{ B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) + \rho(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r) - H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \Big\} \tag{A.112}$$

for all Q_X. Now, choosing R_0 sufficiently large, this condition will be satisfied for any Q_X which satisfies $D(Q_X||P_X) > \mathsf{E}_r$, and then the resulting condition is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{E}_e \leq & \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}:\, \mathsf{R}\leq H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}})} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) \\
& + \mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \Big\} && \text{(A.113)} \\
= & \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}} \max_{t\geq 0} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) \\
& + (t+1) \Big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \Big] \Big\} && \text{(A.114)} \\
\overset{(a)}{=} & \max_{t\geq 1} \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{\tilde{X}|X}} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}, P_{Y|X}) + t \Big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|\tilde{X}}|Q_{\tilde{X}}) \Big] \Big\} && \text{(A.115)}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the maximization problems above, the constraint $Q_X = (Q_X \times Q_{\tilde{X}|X})_{\tilde{X}}$ is also imposed. The passage (a) is because the minimization problem in (A.114) is jointly convex in Q_X (over the convex set $\{Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) : D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_r\}$), $\{Q_{\tilde{X}|X} : Q_{\tilde{X}} = Q_X\}$, and the maximization problem is linear in t (over the convex set $[1, \infty)$), and thus also concave. Therefore, we can interchange the maximization and minimization [40] order, and obtain the condition $\max_{0\leq t\leq 1} e_{\text{ex}}(t) \geq \mathsf{E}_e$.

Sphere packing bound: From Theorem 3 and the sphere packing bound in (21), the rate function $\rho(Q_X; \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{E}_r)$ will not achieve supremum error exponent E_e unless

$$\mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) + \min_{Q_{Y|X}:\, \rho(Q_X;\mathsf{R},\mathsf{E}_r)\leq H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)} D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \tag{A.116}$$

for all Q_X. Now, choosing R_0 sufficiently large this condition will be satisfied for any Q_X which satisfies $D(Q_X||P_X) > \mathsf{E}_r$, and then the resulting condition is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{E}_e \leq & \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{Y|X}:\, \mathsf{R}\leq H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)} \big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \big\} && \text{(A.117)} \\
= & \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \max_{t\geq 0} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \\
& + t \big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y) \big] \Big\} && \text{(A.118)} \\
\overset{(a)}{=} & \max_{t\geq 0} \min_{Q_X:\, D(Q_X||P_X)\leq \mathsf{E}_r} \min_{Q_{Y|X}} \Big\{ D(Q_X||P_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \\
& + t \big[\mathsf{R} - H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y) \big] \Big\} && \text{(A.119)}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is because the minimization problem in (A.118) is convex in Q_X (over the convex set $\{Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) : D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_r\}$), $\{Q_{Y|X}\}$, and the maximization problem is linear in t (over the convex set $[1, \infty)$), and thus

also concave. Therefore, we can interchange the maximization and minimization [40] order, and obtain the condition $\max_{t\geq 0} e_{\text{sp}}(t) \geq \mathsf{E}_e$. ■

Proof of Lemma 16: Introducing an auxiliary PMF $\tilde{Q}_Y$ and using Lemma 32 (Appendix E) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e, \eta) &= \min_{Q_{Y|X}: D(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}||P_{XY}) \leq \mathsf{E}_e} \min_{\tilde{Q}_Y} \{D(Q_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y|Q_X) \\ &\quad + \eta \cdot D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)\} \qquad \text{(A.120)} \\ &= \min_{\tilde{Q}_Y} \min_{Q_{Y|X}: D(Q_X \times Q_{Y|X}||P_{XY}) \leq \mathsf{E}_e} \{D(Q_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y|Q_X) \\ &\quad + \eta \cdot D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)\} \qquad \text{(A.121)} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that (A.121) is an optimization problem over $(Q_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y)$ and consider utilizing an alternating minimization algorithm, where for a given $\tilde{Q}_Y$, the minimizer $Q_{Y|X}$ is found, and vice versa. We divide the rest of the proof into two main parts. In the first part, we prove that the alternating minimization algorithm indeed converges to the optimal solution, and in the second part, we solve the two individual optimization problems (resulting from keeping one of the optimization variables fixed).

Part 1: In [41, Section 5.2], [42] sufficient conditions were derived for the convergence of an alternating minimization algorithm. Specifically, these conditions are met for a minimization problem of the form

$$\inf_{Q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_1} \inf_{Q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_2} D(Q_1||Q_2) \qquad \text{(A.122)}$$

where Q_1 and Q_2 are two positive measures (which may not necessarily sum to 1) over a finite alphabet $\mathcal{Z}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2$ are two convex sets. To prove that alternating minimization algorithm converges for the optimization problem (A.121), we now show that it can be written in the form of (A.122). The objective function of (A.121) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &D(Q_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y|Q_X) + \eta \cdot D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \\ =&\sum_{x,y} Q_X(x) Q_{Y|X}(y|x) \log \frac{\left[Q_{Y|X}(y|x)\right]^{1+\eta}}{\tilde{Q}_Y(y) P_{Y|X}^{\eta}(y|x)} \qquad \text{(A.123)} \\ =&(1+\eta) \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{Q_{XY}(x,y)}{\left[\tilde{Q}_Y(y)\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \left[P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right]^{\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}} Q_X(x)}. \qquad \text{(A.124)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and consider the measures Q_{XY} and $\breve{Q}_{XY} \triangleq \tilde{Q}_Y^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} P_{Y|X}^{\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}} Q_X$ [12] then the objective function is of the form of (A.122). Now, the feasible set for Q_{XY} is

$$\left\{ Q_{XY} : \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} Q_{XY}(x,y) = Q_X(x), D\left(Q_{XY}||P_{XY}\right) \leq \mathsf{E}_e \right\} \qquad \text{(A.125)}$$

which is a convex set. Now, using Corollary 33 of Lemma 32 (Appendix E), we have that the feasible region of

[12] Note that this measure does not necessarily sum to 1.

$\tilde{Q}_Y$ can be extended from the simplex $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y})$ to the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}) \triangleq \left\{ \tilde{Q}_Y : \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \tilde{Q}_Y(y) \leq 1, \tilde{Q}_Y(y) \geq 0 \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{Y} \right\} \tag{A.126}$$

which is also a convex set. Now, define the feasible set for the variables $\breve{Q}_{XY}$ as

$$\breve{\mathcal{Q}} \triangleq \Big\{ \breve{Q}_{XY} : \exists \tilde{Q}_Y \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}) \text{ so that } \breve{Q}_{XY}(x,y) = \Big[\tilde{Q}_Y(y)\Big]^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \left[P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right]^{\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}} Q_X(x) \text{ for all } (x,y) \in \mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y} \Big\}.$$

We show that $\breve{\mathcal{Q}}$ is also a convex set. Let $\breve{Q}_{i,XY}(x,y) = \Big[\tilde{Q}_{i,Y}(y)\Big]^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \left[P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right]^{\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}} Q_X(x)$ for $\tilde{Q}_{i,Y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y})$, $i = 0, 1$, and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \breve{Q}_{\alpha,XY} &\triangleq (1-\alpha)\breve{Q}_{0,XY} + \alpha\breve{Q}_{1,XY} && \text{(A.127)} \\ &= P_{Y|X}^{\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}} Q_X \cdot \left((1-\alpha)\tilde{Q}_{0,Y}^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} + \alpha\tilde{Q}_{1,Y}^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \right). && \text{(A.128)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to show that $\breve{Q}_{\alpha,XY} \in \breve{\mathcal{Q}}$ all is needed to prove is that $\tilde{Q}_{\alpha,Y} \triangleq \left((1-\alpha)\tilde{Q}_{0,Y}^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} + \alpha\tilde{Q}_{1,Y}^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \right)^{1+\eta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y})$. As positivity of $\tilde{Q}_{\alpha,Y}$ is clear, it remains to verify that $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,Y}(y) \leq 1$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,Y}(y) &= \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \left((1-\alpha)\tilde{Q}_{0,Y}^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} + \alpha\tilde{Q}_{1,Y}^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \right)^{1+\eta} && \text{(A.129)} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \left[(1-\alpha) \left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \tilde{Q}_{0,Y}(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} + \alpha \left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \tilde{Q}_{1,Y}(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \right]^{1+\eta} && \text{(A.130)} \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} [(1-\alpha)+\alpha]^{1+\eta} && \text{(A.131)} \\ &= 1 && \text{(A.132)} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from a variant of Minkowski's inequality (Lemma 35 in Appendix E), and (b) is from the fact that both $t^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}}$ and $t^{1+\eta}$ are increasing functions of $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ when $\eta \geq 0$, and $\tilde{Q}_Y \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y})$. Thus the optimization problem (A.121) is of the form (A.122) and an alternating minimization algorithm converges to the optimal, unique, solution, which we denote by $(Q^*_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}^*_Y)$.

Part 2: First, suppose that $\tilde{Q}_Y$ is given. In order to find the minimizer $Q_{Y|X}$ the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions for convex problems [36, Section 5.5.3] can be utilized. Ignoring positivity constraints for the moment, and defining the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q_{Y|X}, \lambda, \mu_x) &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) D(Q_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)||\tilde{Q}_Y) + \eta \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) D\left(Q_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)||P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)\right) \\ &\quad + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) D\left(Q_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)||P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)\right) + \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \mu_x \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_{Y|X}(y|x) \end{aligned} \tag{A.133}$$

$$= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_{Y|X}(y|x) \log \frac{\left[Q_{Y|X}(y|x)\right]^{1+\eta+\lambda}}{\tilde{Q}_Y \left[P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right]^{\eta+\lambda}} + \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \mu_x \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\mu_x \in \mathbb{R}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Differentiating w.r.t. some $Q_{Y|X}(y'|x')$ for $x' \in \mathcal{X}, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial Q_{Y|X}(y'|x')} = Q_X(x') \left((1+\eta+\lambda) \cdot \left(\log Q_{Y|X}(y'|x') + 1\right) + \log \frac{1}{\tilde{Q}_Y(y') \left[P_{Y|X}(y'|x')\right]^{\eta+\lambda}} \right) + \mu_{x'} \quad \text{(A.134)}$$

and equating to zero we get

$$Q_X(x') \cdot \log \frac{\left[Q_{Y|X}(y'|x')\right]^{(1+\eta+\lambda)}}{\left[P_{Y|X}(y'|x')\right]^{\eta+\lambda} \tilde{Q}_Y(y')} + \mu'_{x'} = 0 \quad \text{(A.135)}$$

where $\mu'_{x'} = \mu_{x'} + 1 + \eta + \lambda$. Thus, the argument of the logarithm must not depend on x, and this implies that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $Q_X(x) \neq 0$ we must have

$$Q^*_{Y|X}(y|x) = \psi_x \left[P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right]^{\alpha} \left[\tilde{Q}_Y(y)\right]^{1-\alpha} \quad \text{(A.136)}$$

for $\alpha = \frac{\eta+\lambda}{1+\eta+\lambda}$, where ψ_x is a normalization constant. Clearly, from (73) we have $Q^*_{Y|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\mathsf{g}}(P_{Y|X}, \tilde{Q}_Y, \alpha^*)$. The value of $Q^*_{Y|X}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $Q_X(x) = 0$ is immaterial as it does not affect the optimal value of the objective function. Also, it is evident that the solution $Q^*_{Y|X}$ is indeed positive.

To find the optimal $Q^*_{Y|X}$, we need to choose α in order to satisfy the constraint $D(Q^*_{Y|X}||P_{XY}) \leq \mathsf{E}_e$. For this, the *complementary slackness condition* [36, Section 5.5.2] implies that α should be chosen either to satisfy

$$D(Q^*_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) = \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X) \quad \text{(A.137)}$$

and then $\frac{\eta}{1+\eta} < \alpha \leq 1$, or $\alpha = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$ and then

$$D(Q^*_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) < \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X). \quad \text{(A.138)}$$

To find α^* that satisfies the complementary slackness condition, note that $D(Q^*_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)$ is a monotonically decreasing function of α. Indeed, it is easy to see that if $\tilde{Q}_Y$ is initialized such that

$$\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{Q}_Y) = \mathrm{supp}\left(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right) \quad \text{(A.139)}$$

then this remains true for all iterations. Then, it follows from Lemma 36 (Appendix E) that for any given $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $Q_X(x) \neq 0$, we have that $D(Q^*_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)||P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x))$ is a decreasing function of α, and thus their average $D(Q^*_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)$ is also a decreasing function of α. Thus, if for $\alpha = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$ we have $D(Q^*_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) < \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)$ then $\alpha^* = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$. Otherwise, we have $D(\overline{Q}^{\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}}_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) > \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)$ and $D(\overline{Q}_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) = 0 < \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)$. Thus, in the later case, a simple search finds α^*.

Second, assume that $Q_{Y|X}$ is given. The minimizer $\tilde{Q}_Y$ can be found using Lemma 32 (Appendix E) to be

$$\tilde{Q}_Y(y) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)Q_{Y|X}(y|x). \tag{A.140}$$

It is easily seen that Algorithm 1 indeed implements the procedure described in this proof. ■

Proof of Lemma 17: Introducing an auxiliary PMF $\tilde{Q}_Y$ and using Lemma 32 (Appendix E), we get that

$$e_{\text{rb}}(P_{XY},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{E}_r,t) \triangleq \min_{\tilde{Q}_Y}\min_{Q_X:D(Q_X||P_X)\le\mathsf{E}_r}\min_{Q_{Y|X}} \left\{D(Q_X||P_X)+D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)+t\cdot\left[\mathsf{R}-H(Q_X)+D(Q_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y|Q_X)\right]\right\}.$$

Now, Algorithm 2 is an alternating minimization algorithm, that keeps all parameters but one fixed, and optimizes over the non-fixed parameter. Now, for a given $t\ge 0$, the objective function in (64) is given by

$$(1+t)\cdot\sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x,y)\log\frac{Q_{XY}(x,y)}{[P_{XY}(x,y)]^{\frac{1}{1+t}}\left[\tilde{Q}_Y(y)\right]^{\frac{t}{1+t}}}+t\mathsf{R}. \tag{A.141}$$

The same technique that was used in the proof of Lemma 16, shows that this optimization problem is of the form (A.122) (with additional constant $t\mathsf{R}$). Thus, an alternating minimization algorithm converges to the optimal solution.

We now turn to the minimization of individual variables, assuming that all other variables are fixed, for a given $t\ge 0$. First, consider the minimization over Q_{XY}, which itself can be separated to an unconstrained minimization over $Q_{Y|X}$ and a constrained minimization over Q_X. The minimizer $Q^*_{Y|X}$ can again be found using similar Lagrange methods as in the proof of Lemma 16. The result is $Q^*_{Y|X}=\mathbb{M}_{\text{g}}(P_{Y|X},\tilde{Q}_Y,\frac{1}{1+t})$ (for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$ such that $Q_X(x)\neq 0$, and arbitrary otherwise, since the value of $Q^*_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)$ for $x\in\mathcal{X}$ such that $Q_X(x)=0$ does not affect the value of the optimization problem). For this optimal choice, using the definitions of $h_{1,t}(x)$ and $h_{2,t}(x)$ we obtain

$$\min_{\tilde{Q}_Y}\min_{Q_X:D(Q_X||P_X)\le\mathsf{E}_r}\left\{D(Q_X||P_X)+\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}Q_X(x)h_{1,t}(x)+t\cdot\left[\mathsf{R}-H(Q_X)+\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}Q_X(x)h_{2,t}(x)\right]\right\}. \tag{A.142}$$

Next, we optimize over Q_X using the KKT conditions. The Lagrangian with $\lambda\ge 0$ and μ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q_X,\lambda,\mu) &\triangleq D(Q_X||P_X)+\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}Q_X(x)h_{1,t}(x)+t\cdot\left[\mathsf{R}-H(Q_X)+\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}Q_X(x)h_{2,t}(x)\right] \\ &\quad +\lambda\cdot D(Q_X||P_X)+\mu\cdot\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}Q_x \\ &= t\cdot\mathsf{R}+\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}Q_X(x)\left[\log\left(\frac{[Q_X(x)]^{1+t+\lambda}}{[P_X(x)]^{1+\lambda}}\cdot\exp(h_{1,t}(x)+t\cdot h_{2,t}(x))\right)+\mu\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{A.143}$$

Differentiating w.r.t. some $Q_X(x')$ for $x' \in \mathcal{X}$, we get

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial Q_X(x')} = \log\left(\frac{[Q_X(x')]^{1+t+\lambda}}{[P_X(x')]^{1+\lambda}} \cdot \exp(h_{1,t}(x') + t \cdot h_{2,t}(x'))\right) + (1+t+\lambda) + \mu \tag{A.144}$$

and equating to zero results in

$$Q_X^*(x) = \psi \cdot [P_X(x)]^{\frac{1+\lambda}{1+\lambda+t}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1+t+\lambda} \cdot h_{1,t}(x) - \frac{t}{1+t+\lambda} \cdot h_{2,t}(x)\right) \tag{A.145}$$

where ψ is a normalization constant. From the definition (81), it is evident that $Q_X^* = \mathbb{M}_{\mathrm{h}}(P_X, h_1, h_2, \lambda, t)$. Using the complementary slackness condition [36, Section 5.5.2], λ should be found such that either $D(Q_X^*||P_X) = \mathsf{E}_r$ or $\lambda = 0$. From Lemma 36 (Appendix E) $D(Q_X^*||P_X)$ is a monotonic decreasing function of λ and thus the above search is relatively simple. To see that the conditions of Lemma 36 are met, notice that initializing $\tilde{Q}_Y$ with support $\mathcal{Y}$ implies that in the first iteration $\mathrm{supp}(Q_{Y|X}^*) = \mathrm{supp}(P_{Y|X})$ which assures that $h_{1,t}(x)$ and $h_{2,t}(x)$ are finite. As $\mathrm{supp}(Q_X^*) = \mathrm{supp}(P_X) = \mathcal{X}$ for all $\lambda > 0$ and $t \geq 0$ then $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{Q}_Y) = \mathcal{Y}$ for all iterations (cf. (A.150)). Thus, for any $t \neq 0$ we may express Q_X^* as

$$Q_X^*(x) = \psi \cdot [P_X(x)]^{\frac{1+\lambda}{1+\lambda+t}} \cdot \left[\breve{P}_X(x)\right]^{\frac{t}{1+\lambda+t}} \tag{A.146}$$

where

$$\breve{P}_X(x) \triangleq \breve{\psi} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h_{1,t}(x)}{t} - h_{2,t}(x)\right) \tag{A.147}$$

and $\breve{\psi}$ is a normalization factor. Setting $\alpha = \frac{1+\lambda}{1+\lambda+t}$ we get that $D(Q_X^*||P_X)$ is a decreasing function of α. Since α is a monotonically increasing function of λ this implies that $D(Q_X^*||P_X)$ is also a decreasing function of λ. For $t = 0$ we may write again

$$Q_X^*(x) = \psi \cdot P_X^{\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}}(x) \cdot \breve{P}_X^{\frac{1}{1+\lambda}}(x) \tag{A.148}$$

where now

$$\breve{P}_X(x) \triangleq \breve{\psi} \cdot \exp\left(-h_{1,t}(x) + \log P_X(x)\right). \tag{A.149}$$

Similar arguments show that $D(Q_X^*||P_X)$ is a decreasing function of λ.

The optimal $\tilde{Q}_Y^*$ for a given t and $Q_X, Q_{Y|X}$ is simply

$$\tilde{Q}_Y^*(y) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) Q_{Y|X}(y|x), \tag{A.150}$$

using Lemma 32. ∎

Proof of Lemma 18: Clearly (72) can be written as

$$v_{\mathrm{ex}}(P_{XY}, Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) = \min_{\breve{Q}_{X\tilde{X}} \in \mathcal{G}} D(\breve{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}||Q_X \times Q_X), \tag{A.151}$$

where $\mathcal{G} \triangleq \mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2 \cap \mathcal{G}_3$ and

$$\mathcal{G}_1 \triangleq \{Q_{X\tilde{X}} : B(Q_{X\tilde{X}}) = \mathsf{E}_e + D(Q_X||P_X)\}, \tag{A.152}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2 \triangleq \{\breve{Q}_X = Q_X\}, \tag{A.153}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_3 \triangleq \{\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}} = Q_X\}. \tag{A.154}$$

It may be easily seen that $\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^3$ are *linear families*[13]. In [41, Theorem 5.1], the convergence of an iterative algorithm for a minimization problem of the form

$$\min_{\breve{Q}\in\mathcal{G}} D(\breve{Q}||Q), \tag{A.155}$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is the intersection of a finite number of linear families, was proved. The minimizer of (A.155) is called the I-projection of Q onto $\mathcal{G}$ and denoted $\breve{Q}^*$. The algorithm is called *iterative scaling* and works as follows: First $\breve{Q}^{(0)} = Q$ is initialized. Then, $\breve{Q}^{(1)}$ is the I-projection of $\breve{Q}^{(0)}$ onto $\mathcal{G}_1$, $\breve{Q}^{(2)}$ is the I-projection of $\breve{Q}^{(1)}$ onto $\mathcal{G}_2$, and so on, where for $n > L$, $\breve{Q}^{(n)}$ is the I-projection of $\breve{Q}^{(n-1)}$ onto $\mathcal{G}_{n \mod L}$. Such a procedure converges to $\breve{Q}^*$.

Thus, to use the iterative scaling algorithm for the case at hand, we initialize $\breve{Q}^{(0)}_{X\tilde{X}}(x,\tilde{x}) = Q_X(x)Q_X(\tilde{x})$ for all $(x,\tilde{x}) \in \mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}$, and then we need to find for any given PMF $\tilde{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}$ the I-projections

$$\min_{\breve{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}\in\mathcal{G}_i} D(\breve{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}||\tilde{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}) \tag{A.156}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. In what follows we will perform the I-projection on $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2$ jointly, and then on $\mathcal{G}_3$. In this case, $\tilde{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}$ is of the form $Q_X \times \tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}$ for all iterations.

First, for $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2$, we need to solve

$$\min_{\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}: B(Q_X\times\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X})+D(Q_X||P_X)=\mathsf{E}_e} D(Q_X \times \breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}||Q_X \times \tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}). \tag{A.157}$$

Ignoring positivity constraints for the moment, we define the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L(\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}, \lambda, \mu_x) \;=\; & \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},\tilde{x}\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x)\log\frac{\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x)}{\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(x,\tilde{x})} \\ & +\lambda\cdot\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},\tilde{x}\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x)d_{P_{Y|X}}(x,\tilde{x}) + \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\mu_x\sum_{\tilde{x}\in\mathcal{X}}\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) \end{aligned} \tag{A.158}$$

and $\lambda, \mu_x \in \mathbb{R}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Differentiating w.r.t. some $\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}'|x')$ for $x', \tilde{x}' \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}'|x')} = Q_X(x')\left(\log\frac{\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}'|x')}{\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}'|x')} + 1\right) + \lambda\cdot Q_X(x')d_{P_{Y|X}}(x',\tilde{x}') + \mu_{x'} \tag{A.159}$$

[13]A linear family of PMFs over the alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, is any set of the form $\left\{Q_X : \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)f_i(x) = \alpha_i, 1 \le i \le K\right\}$ for some given functions $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^K$ and constants $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^K$.

and equating to zero we get

$$Q_X(x') \cdot \log \frac{\breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}'|x') \cdot \exp\left[\lambda \cdot d_{P_{Y|X}}(x', \tilde{x}')\right]}{\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}'|x')} + \mu'_{x'} = 0 \tag{A.160}$$

where $\mu'_{x'} = \mu_{x'} + 1$. Thus, the argument of the logarithm must not depend on x, and this implies that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $Q_X(x) \neq 0$ we must have

$$\breve{Q}^*_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) = \psi_x \tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) \exp\left[-\lambda \cdot d_{P_{Y|X}}(x, \tilde{x})\right] \tag{A.161}$$

where ψ_x is a normalization constant, such that $\sum_{\tilde{x}\in\mathcal{X}} \breve{Q}^*_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) = 1$, for any $x \in \mathrm{supp}(Q_X)$, namely $\breve{Q}^*_{\tilde{X}|X} = \mathbb{M}_{\mathsf{B}}(\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}, P_{Y|X}, \lambda)$. The value of $\breve{Q}^*_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $Q_X(x) = 0$ is immaterial as it does not affect the optimal value of the objective function. Also, it is evident that the solution $\breve{Q}^*_{\tilde{X}|X}$ is indeed positive. Finally, we need to find $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the constraint $B(Q_X \times \breve{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}) + D(Q_X||P_X) = \mathsf{E}_e$ is satisfied, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_e + D(Q_X||P_X) &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},\tilde{x}\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)\breve{Q}^*_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) d_{P_{Y|X}}(x, \tilde{x}) && \text{(A.162)} \\ &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},\tilde{x}\in\mathcal{X}} \psi_x \tilde{Q}_{\tilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x) \exp(-\lambda \cdot d_{P_{Y|X}}(x, \tilde{x})) d_{P_{Y|X}}(x, \tilde{x}). && \text{(A.163)} \end{aligned}$$

Second, the linear family $\mathcal{G}_2$ induces a simple constraint on the $\tilde{X}$-marginal of $\breve{Q}_{X\tilde{X}}$. In this case, the *lumping property* [41, Lemma 4.1 and Section 5.1] implies that the I-projection onto $\mathcal{G}_2$ is given by $\breve{Q}^*_{X\tilde{X}} = \mathbb{M}_{\mathsf{I}}(\tilde{Q}_{X\tilde{X}})$, which evidently satisfies $\breve{Q}^*_{X\tilde{X}} \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

It is easily seen that Algorithm 3 indeed implements the procedure described in this proof. ■

APPENDIX B

In this appendix, we will focus only on codes for the channel W. As mentioned in subsection II-C, $\underline{E}^*_e(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $\overline{E}^*_e(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ are not fully known. Nonetheless, some of their general properties can be obtained, and these are useful for SW codes. Notice that in channel coding, the type of the fixed composition code is under the control of the code designer. Indeed, according to the definition of the infimum fixed-composition reliability function, to achieve $\underline{E}^*_e(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$, one needs to find a sequence of types $Q_X^{(n)} \to Q_X$ with required error probability, but it is not required that $Q_X^{(n)} = Q_X$ for all n. In Theorem 2, we transform channel codes into SW codes, and conditioning on the event that the source block belongs to the type Q_X, we would like to achieve conditional error exponent of $\underline{E}^*_e(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ for the SW code. Thus, for SW coding, the type is determined by the source, and there is no flexibility to choose a 'nearby' type, since the type of the source block is not under the control of the code designer. The next three lemmas address this issue. Lemma 24 shows that if two types are close, then by concatenating a relatively short vector (of length linear in the block length, with small coefficient) one can modify a vector from the first type to *exactly* the second type. Lemma 25 shows that if a sequence of channel codes exists with good error probability for block lengths which are not too far apart, then there is also a sequence of channel codes for *all* block lengths sufficiently large, with essentially the same performance. Lemma 26 states that the infimum



Figure 5. Dependency graph of various proofs.

reliability function can be achieved with codes of type Q_X *exactly*, when the block length is sufficiently large. Finally, Proposition 27 discusses the monotonicity and continuity of $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$, which is of importance since we will be interested in the inverses of these functions. We first formulate all the Lemmas and the Proposition mentioned above, and only afterwards provide their proofs. To assist the reader, Figure 5 displays the connections between the proofs. In this graph, the proof of any given result, depends on the results displayed above it. For example, the proof of Lemma 26 requires the result of Lemma 24.

Lemma 24. *Assume that* $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}), \overline{Q} \in \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $||Q - \overline{Q}|| = \epsilon$. *Also, let* $Q^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ *be such that* $Q^{(n)} \to Q$. *Then, there exists* $\mathbf{z}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{l_n}$ *such that if* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q^{(n)})$ *then* $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})} \to \overline{Q}$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *and* $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{l_n}{n} = 0$.

Moreover, assume, in addition, that $\overline{Q} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. *Then, there exists* $\mathbf{z}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{l_n}$ *and* $\overline{\epsilon} > 0$, *such that for any* $0 < \epsilon < \overline{\epsilon}$ *if* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q^{(n)})$ *then* $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})} = \overline{Q}$ *for* n *sufficiently large, and* $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{l_n}{n} = 0$.

The lengths $n + l_n$ in Lemma 24 need not be increasing. However, since $n + l_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, a strictly increasing sub-sequence may be extracted with the desired property. So, henceforth we will assume that $n + l_n$ is an increasing sequence.

Lemma 25. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a sequence of fixed composition codes $\mathcal{C}_{n_k} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{n_k}(Q_X^{(k)})$ such that $Q_X^{(k)} \to Q_X$, and*

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \log|\mathcal{C}_{n_k}| \geq \mathsf{R}, \tag{B.1}$$

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}_{n_k}) = \mathsf{E}_e. \tag{B.2}$$

Then, if $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{(n_{k+1}-n_k)}{n_k} = \delta$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and a sequence $\mathcal{C}'$ of fixed composition codes $\mathcal{C}'_m \subseteq \mathcal{T}_m(Q_X^{(m)})$ such that $Q_X^{(m)} \to Q_X$, and

$$\liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log|\mathcal{C}'_m| \geq \mathsf{R} - \epsilon \tag{B.3}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_c^-(\mathcal{C}') \geq \mathsf{E}_e - \epsilon, \tag{B.4}$$

where $\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \epsilon = 0$.

Lemma 26. *Let $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$, and let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the minimal block length such that $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a sequence of fixed composition codes $\mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^{(n)})$ such that $Q_X^{(n)} \to Q_X$, and $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log|\mathcal{C}_n| \geq \mathsf{R}$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence of fixed composition channel codes $\mathcal{C}'_m \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{m\cdot n_0}(Q_X)$ such that $\liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{mn_0} \log|\mathcal{C}'_m| \geq \mathsf{R} - \epsilon$, and $\liminf_{m\to\infty} -\frac{1}{mn_0} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}'_m) \geq \mathcal{E}_c^-(\mathcal{C}) - \epsilon$.*

Proposition 27. *For a given channel W, the functions $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ and $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ are:*

1) *Strictly decreasing functions of R in the interval $(C_0(Q_X, W), I(Q_X \times W))$.*
2) *Continuous functions of (R, Q_X) for $\mathsf{R} \in (C_0(Q_X, W), I(Q_X \times W))$.*

Proof of Lemma 24: We will prove this fact by induction over the alphabet size $|\mathcal{X}|$, where without loss of generality (w.l.o.g.) we denote $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, \ldots, |\mathcal{X}|-1\}$. If $Q = \overline{Q}$ then the Lemma is trivial, thus we assume $Q \neq \overline{Q}$ and so there exists a letter x^*, such that $\overline{Q}(x^*) > Q(x^*)$. W.l.o.g., we assume $x^* = 0$. Then, for any sufficiently large n, we also get $\overline{Q}(0) > Q^{(n)}(0)$.

For $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ letting

$$l_n = \left\lceil n \cdot \frac{\overline{Q}(0) - Q^{(n)}(0)}{1 - \overline{Q}(0)} \right\rceil \tag{B.5}$$

$$= n \cdot \frac{\overline{Q}(0) - Q^{(n)}(0)}{1 - \overline{Q}(0)} + \alpha_n \tag{B.6}$$

for some $0 \leq \alpha_n < 1$, and choosing $\mathbf{z}^{(n)} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{X}^{l_n}$, we get

$$\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})}(0) = \frac{n \cdot Q^{(n)}(0) + l_n}{n + l_n} \tag{B.7}$$

$$= \frac{Q^{(n)}(0) + (\overline{Q}(0) - Q^{(n)}(0))/(1-\overline{Q}(0)) + \alpha_n/n}{1 + (\overline{Q}(0) - Q^{(n)}(0))/(1-\overline{Q}(0)) + \alpha_n/n} \tag{B.8}$$

$$= \frac{\overline{Q}(0)(1 - Q^{(n)}(0)) + (\alpha_n/n)\,(1 - \overline{Q}(0))}{1 - Q^{(n)}(0) + (\alpha_n/n)\,(1 - \overline{Q}(0))} \tag{B.9}$$

$$\to \overline{Q}(0) \tag{B.10}$$

as $n \to \infty$, and clearly also $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})}(1) \to \overline{Q}(1)$. In addition, for all sufficiently large n and any $\epsilon' > \epsilon$

$$l_n = n \cdot \frac{\overline{Q}(0) - Q^{(n)}(0)}{1 - \overline{Q}(0)} + \alpha_n \tag{B.11}$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{|\overline{Q}(0) - Q^{(n)}(0)|}{1 - \overline{Q}(0)} + \alpha_n \tag{B.12}$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{\epsilon'/2}{1 - \overline{Q}(0)} + \alpha_n \tag{B.13}$$

since $\epsilon = 2\left[\overline{Q}(0) - Q(0)\right]$. So, $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{l_n}{n} = 0$ and the statement of the lemma is proved for $|\mathcal{X}|= 2$. Now, assume that the statement of the lemma holds for $|\mathcal{X}|\geq 2$ and consider an alphabet $\overline{\mathcal{X}} = \{0, 1, \ldots, |\mathcal{X}|\}$ of size $|\mathcal{X}|+1$. For this case too, we may assume w.l.o.g. that $\overline{Q}(0) \geq Q(0)$, and for every sufficiently large n, $\overline{Q}(0) \geq Q^{(n)}(0)$. Now, let $\mathcal{X}_1 = \{1, \ldots, |\mathcal{X}|+1\}$, and consider the distributions $\tilde{Q}, \grave{Q} \in \operatorname{int} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}_1)$ given for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$ by

$$\tilde{Q}(x) \triangleq \frac{Q(x)}{1 - Q(0)}, \tag{B.14}$$

$$\tilde{Q}^{(n)}(x) \triangleq \frac{Q^{(n)}(x)}{1 - Q^{(n)}(0)}, \tag{B.15}$$

and

$$\grave{Q}(x) \triangleq \frac{\overline{Q}(x)}{1 - \overline{Q}(0)}, \tag{B.16}$$

namely, the conditional distribution of X given that $X \neq 0$. We then also have $||\tilde{Q} - \grave{Q}|| = \epsilon'$ where $\epsilon' \downarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. For any $\mathbf{x}$, let $\chi_0(\mathbf{x})$ be the vector obtained by *deleting* all the $'0'$ components of $\mathbf{x}$, e.g. $\chi_0([1, 0, 2]) = [1, 2]$. From the induction assumption, since $|\mathcal{X}_1| = |\mathcal{X}|$, there exists a sequence of vectors $\mathbf{z}_1^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}_1^{m_n}$ such that for any given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q^{(n)})$, $\hat{Q}_{\chi_0\left((\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}_1^{(n)})\right)}(x) \to \grave{Q}(x)$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$, and $\lim_{\epsilon' \downarrow 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{m_n}{n(1-Q^{(n)}(0))} = 0$. Thus, we have found a sequence of vectors such that when concatenated to $\mathbf{x}$, the relative frequency of each $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$ in the concatenated vector tends to $\grave{Q}(x)$. It remains to assure that the relative frequency of the letter $0 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ in the final vector will also tend to $\overline{Q}(0)$. Now,

$$\overline{Q}(0) > Q^{(n)}(0) > \frac{n}{n + m_n} Q^{(n)}(0) = \hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}_1^{(n)})}(0) \tag{B.17}$$

for sufficiently large n, and then for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, we have $\overline{Q}(0) - \hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}_1^{(n)})}(0) < 2\epsilon$. Thus, just as for the case of $|\mathcal{X}|= 2$, one can concatenate another sequence of vectors $\mathbf{z}_0^{(n)} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{X}^{m'_n}$ such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q^{(n)})$, the relative frequency of $x = 0$ in $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_1^{(n)}, \mathbf{z}_0^{(n)})$ tends to $\overline{Q}_X(0)$ as $n \to \infty$, and $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{m'_n}{n} = 0$. Consequently, $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}_1^{(n)},\mathbf{z}_0^{(n)})} \to \overline{Q}$ as $n \to \infty$. The total length of the concatenated fixed sequence $l_n = m_n + m'_n$ satisfies $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{l_n}{n} = 0$.

Next, we consider the case in which $\overline{Q} \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}(\mathcal{X})$, where $n_0 > 1$ is the minimal block length satisfying this property. We will use the following two simple facts:

- *Fact 1:* If $Q, \overline{Q} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and $||Q - \overline{Q}|| < \frac{2}{n}$ then $Q = \overline{Q}$.

- *Fact 2:* Let $\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^n$ and assume that for some $\overline{Q}$, we have $||\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}} - \overline{Q}|| \leq \frac{2}{n}$. Also, denote $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(0) = \frac{k}{n}$ and assume w.l.o.g. that $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}(0) = \frac{k}{n} < \overline{Q}(0)$, where consequently $k < n$. Then $||\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},0)} - \overline{Q}|| \leq \frac{2}{n+1}$. To see this, notice that

$$k + 1 - (n+1)\overline{Q}(0) < k + 1 - (n+1)\frac{k}{n} < 1 \tag{B.18}$$

and since $||\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}} - \overline{Q}|| \leq \frac{2}{n}$ then

$$\overline{Q}(0) - \frac{k}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n} \tag{B.19}$$

and also

$$k + 1 - (n+1)\overline{Q}(0) \geq -\frac{k+1}{n} \geq -1. \tag{B.20}$$

Thus,

$$||\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},0)} - \overline{Q}|| = 2 \cdot \left| \frac{k+1}{n+1} - \overline{Q}(0) \right| \tag{B.21}$$

$$= \frac{2}{n+1} \cdot \left| k + 1 - (n+1)\overline{Q}(0) \right| \tag{B.22}$$

$$\overset{(a)}{\leq} \frac{2}{n+1} \tag{B.23}$$

where (a) follows from (B.18) and (B.20).

Now, for $|\mathcal{X}| = 2$, recall the construction before (B.5) and onward, and let the resulting size of the vector $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{(n)})$ be $n + m_n$. Denote

$$\gamma_n \triangleq \frac{1 - \overline{Q}(0)}{1 - Q^{(n)}(0)}. \tag{B.24}$$

From the assumption $\overline{Q}(0) > Q(0)$, we get $\gamma = \lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n < 1$. Let γ' satisfy $\gamma < \gamma' < 1$. Then, on the one hand for n sufficiently large, we have from (B.9)

$$\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})}(0) = \left(\overline{Q}(0) + \frac{\alpha_n \gamma_n}{n} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\alpha_n \gamma_n / n)} \tag{B.25}$$

$$\leq \overline{Q}(0) + \frac{\gamma_n \alpha_n}{n} \tag{B.26}$$

$$< \overline{Q}(0) + \frac{\gamma'}{n} \tag{B.27}$$

and on the other hand,

$$\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})}(0) = \left(\overline{Q}(0) + \frac{\alpha_n \gamma_n}{n} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\alpha_n \gamma_n / n)} \tag{B.28}$$

$$\geq \left(\overline{Q}(0) + \frac{\alpha_n \gamma_n}{n} \right) \cdot \left(1 - \gamma_n \frac{\alpha_n}{n} \right) \tag{B.29}$$

$$= \overline{Q}(0) + (1 - \overline{Q}(0)) \cdot \gamma_n \frac{\alpha_n}{n} - \left[\frac{\gamma_n \alpha_n}{n} \right]^2 \tag{B.30}$$

$$\geq \overline{Q}(0) - \left[\frac{\gamma_n \alpha_n}{n} \right]^2 \tag{B.31}$$

$$> \overline{Q}(0) - \frac{\gamma'}{n}. \tag{B.32}$$

Thus, for sufficiently large n,

$$||\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})} - \overline{Q}|| < \frac{2\gamma'}{n}. \tag{B.33}$$

Moreover, from (B.13), for sufficiently large n, we have $\frac{m_n}{n} \leq \delta'$ where $\delta' > \delta$ and

$$\delta = \frac{\epsilon/2}{1 - \overline{Q}(0)}. \tag{B.34}$$

Then, since

$$\gamma \cdot (1+\delta) = \frac{1-\overline{Q}(0)}{1-Q(0)} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon/2}{1-\overline{Q}(0)}\right) \tag{B.35}$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-Q(0)} \cdot \left(1 - \overline{Q}(0) + \epsilon/2\right) \tag{B.36}$$

$$= 1 \tag{B.37}$$

for sufficiently large n, (B.33) implies

$$||\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})} - \overline{Q}|| < \frac{2\gamma'}{n} \tag{B.38}$$

$$< \frac{2\gamma'}{n(1+\delta)\gamma} \tag{B.39}$$

$$\leq \frac{2\gamma'}{(n+m_n)\gamma}. \tag{B.40}$$

Since this is true for any $\gamma' > \gamma$ then

$$||\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)})} - \overline{Q}|| \quad \leq \quad \frac{2}{n+m_n}. \tag{B.41}$$

Let $k^*(n) \triangleq \left\lceil \frac{n+m_n}{n_0} \right\rceil$ and $m'_n = n_0 \cdot k^*(n) - n$ and construct $\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{m'_n}$ iteratively in the following way:

1) Initialize $\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)}$ with the empty string.

2) For $i = 1$ to $i = m'_n$: If $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)},\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)})}(0) < \overline{Q}(0)$ then set $\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)} \leftarrow (\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)}, 0)$ and otherwise set $\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)} \leftarrow (\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)}, 1)$.

From the second general fact above and (B.41) we have

$$||\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)},\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)})} - \overline{Q}|| \leq \frac{2}{n+m_n+m'_n}. \tag{B.42}$$

If the inequality in (B.42) is strict, then since $(n + m_n + m'_n) \mod n_0 = 0$, clearly $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)},\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)})} = \overline{Q}$ and by setting $l_n = m_n + m'_n$ and the fact that $m'_n < n_0$, we get the desired result. Otherwise, if equality is obtained in (B.42) then let $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{z}}}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{n_0}$ such that $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{z}}}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{T}_{n_0}(\overline{\overline{Q}})$ where

$$\overline{\overline{Q}}(0) = \overline{Q}(0) + \frac{1}{n_0} \tag{B.43}$$

if $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)},\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)})}(0) < \overline{Q}(0)$ and

$$\overline{\overline{Q}}(0) = \overline{Q}(0) - \frac{1}{n_0} \tag{B.44}$$

if $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)},\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)})}(0) > \overline{Q}(0)$. It is easily verified that $\hat{Q}_{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}^{(n)},\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(n)},\overline{\overline{\mathbf{z}}}^{(n)})} = \overline{Q}$. By setting $l_n = m_n + m'_n + n_0$ and the fact that $m'_n < n_0$ we get the desired result.

Finally, for $|\mathcal{X}| > 2$, notice that from (B.16), if $\overline{Q} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ then also $\grave{Q}(x) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. Then, the same proof by induction can be used, just as for the first statement of the lemma. ■

Proof of Lemma 25: For any given block length m, let $k(m)$ be such that $n_{k(m)} < m < n_{k(m)+1}$, and thus for any $\delta' > \delta$, and sufficiently large m we have $m - n_{k(m)} \leq \delta' n_{k(m)}$. Next, find the vector $\mathbf{w}^{(m)} \in \mathcal{X}^{m-n_{k(m)}}$ with empirical distribution closet possible to Q_X (in the variation distance norm). Denote this empirical distribution by $\grave{Q}^{(m)}$. The code $\mathcal{C}'_m$ will be constructed by concatenating the fixed vector $\mathbf{w}^{(m)}$ to the codewords $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_{n_{k(m)}}$. The rate of this code satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}'_m|}{m} &= \liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{n_{k(m)}}{m} \cdot \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_{n_k}|}{n_{k(m)}} && \text{(B.45)}\\
&\geq \frac{\mathsf{R}}{1+\delta'} && \text{(B.46)}\\
&\geq \mathsf{R} - \epsilon' && \text{(B.47)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lim_{\delta'\downarrow 0} \epsilon' = 0$. Since the error probability of $\mathcal{C}'_m$ is equal to the error probability of $\mathcal{C}_{n_k}$, its error exponent is

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{m\to\infty} -\frac{1}{m} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}'_m) &= \liminf_{m\to\infty} -\frac{n_{k(m)}}{m}\frac{1}{n_{k(m)}} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}'_m) && \text{(B.48)}\\
&\geq \frac{\mathsf{E}_e}{1+\delta'} && \text{(B.49)}\\
&\geq \mathsf{E}_e - \epsilon'' && \text{(B.50)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lim_{\delta'\downarrow 0} \epsilon'' = 0$. Choosing $\epsilon = \max\{\epsilon', \epsilon''\}$ we get $\lim_{\delta'\downarrow 0} \epsilon = 0$. To conclude, it only remains to prove that if ${Q'}_X^{(m)}$ is the type of the codewords of $\mathcal{C}'_m$ then ${Q'}_X^{(m)} \to Q_X$ as $m \to \infty$. To show this, notice that since $\grave{Q}^{(m)} \in \mathcal{P}_{m-n_{k(m)}}(\mathcal{X})$ is the closest type to Q_X then[14]

$$||\grave{Q}^{(m)} - Q_X|| \leq \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{m - n_{k(m)}} \tag{B.51}$$

and so

$$\frac{m - n_{k(m)}}{m} \cdot ||\grave{Q}^{(m)} - Q_X|| \leq \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{m}. \tag{B.52}$$

Also

$${Q'}_X^{(m)} = \frac{n_{k(m)}}{m} \cdot Q_X^{(k(m))} + \frac{m - n_{k(m)}}{m} \cdot \grave{Q}^{(m)} \tag{B.53}$$

[14]A non-optimal choice for $\grave{Q}^{(m)}$ is to round the first $m - n_{k(m)} - 1$ components of Q_X to multiples of $\frac{1}{m-n_{k(m)}}$. This results the variation distance in the bound.

and by convexity of the variation distance ($\mathcal{L}_1$ norm), for m sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} ||Q'^{(m)}_X - Q_X|| &\leq \frac{n_{k(m)}}{m} \cdot ||Q^{(k(m))}_X - Q_X|| + \frac{m - n_{k(m)}}{m} \cdot ||\grave{Q}^{(m)} - Q_X|| && \text{(B.54)} \\ &\leq \frac{n_{k(m)}}{m} \cdot ||Q^{(k(m))}_X - Q_X|| + \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{m} && \text{(B.55)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1+\delta'} \cdot ||Q^{(k(m))}_X - Q_X|| + \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{m} && \text{(B.56)} \end{aligned}$$

and since $Q^{(k(m))}_X \to Q_X$ as $m \to \infty$ also $Q'^{(m)}_X \to Q_X$. ■

Proof of Lemma 26: Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. By setting $\overline{Q}_X = Q_X$ in the second part of Lemma 24, there exists a sequence of vectors $\mathbf{z}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{l_n}$, such that if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q^{(n)}_X)$, the concatenation $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{(n)}) \in \mathcal{T}_{n+l_n}(Q_X)$, and $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{l_n}{n} = 0$. Let us now construct a sequence of channel codes $\mathcal{C}'$ were $\mathcal{C}'_{k_n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{k_n}(Q'^{(n)}_X)$ is of length $k_n = l_n + n$, and such that $Q'^{(n)}_X = Q_X$ for sufficiently large n, by concatenating to the codewords $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_n$ the fixed vector $\mathbf{z}^{(n)}$. Now, the rate of the sequence of the new codes $\mathcal{C}'$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}|}{k_n} &= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{k_n} \cdot \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_{k_n}|}{n} && \text{(B.57)} \\ &= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{n(1+\frac{l_n}{n})} \cdot \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_{k_n}|}{n} && \text{(B.58)} \\ &= \mathsf{R} && \text{(B.59)} \end{aligned}$$

and since the error probability of $\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}$ is equal to the error probability of $\mathcal{C}_n$, its error exponent is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^-_c(\mathcal{C}') &= \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{k_n} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}). && \text{(B.60)} \\ &= \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{n}{k_n} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}_n) && \text{(B.61)} \\ &= \mathcal{E}^-_c(\mathcal{C}). && \text{(B.62)} \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q^{(n)}_X)$, we have $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{(n)}) \in \mathcal{T}_{k_n}(Q_X)$, $k_n \mod n_0 = 0$. Now, let us focus on the block length $m \cdot n_0$ for any m sufficiently large. There must exist $n_1(m)$ and $n_2(m)$ such that $k_{n_1(m)} \leq m \cdot n_0 \leq k_{n_2(m)}$[15]. If $k_{n_1(m)} < m \cdot n_0 < k_{n_2(m)}$ then as in Lemma 25, one can concatenate a fixed vector $\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(m)} \in \mathcal{X}^{m\cdot n_0 - k_{n_1(m)}}$ to the codewords of $\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}$ such that $\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(m)} \in \mathcal{T}_{m\cdot n_0 - k_{n_1(m)}}(Q_X)$, and obtain a codebook $\mathcal{C}''_m \in \mathcal{T}_m(Q_X)$. Since

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{k_{n+1} - k_n}{k_n} = 0 \qquad \text{(B.63)}$$

then also

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{k_{n_2(m)} - k_{n_1(m)}}{k_{n_2(m)}} = 0 \qquad \text{(B.64)}$$

the effect of $\overline{\mathbf{z}}^{(m)}$ on the rate and error exponent is negligible, using similar arguments to to the ones used in the proof of Lemma 25. ■

[15]The reason for not choosing $n_2(m) = n_1(m) + 1$ is because the lengths $k_n = l_n + n$, guaranteed by Lemma 24 are not necessarily increasing.

Proof of Proposition 27: Since for any $Q_X, Q'_X \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$ and R, R'

$$|\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) - \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}', Q'_X, W)| \leq |\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) - \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q'_X, W)| + |\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q'_X, W) - \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}', Q'_X, W)| \quad \text{(B.65)}$$

then continuity in R and in Q_X may be proved separately. The same is true for $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$. Accordingly, the proof is divided into two steps: In the first step we will prove continuity and monotonicity in R, and the first property of the proposition will be proved. Then, in the second step, we will prove continuity in Q'_X, which combined with the first property and (B.65), proves the second property of the proposition. Notice that if $\mathsf{R} \in (C_0(Q_X, W), I(Q_X \times W))$ then for Q'_X sufficiently close to Q_X also we have $\mathsf{R} \in (C_0(Q'_X, W), I(Q'_X \times W))$ using the continuity of $C_0(Q_X, W)$[16] and $I(Q_X \times W)$ in Q_X.

Step I: The fact that $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in R was established by Haroutunian [43], [44]. Since the proof is based on the sphere packing bound, which is also valid for the infimum error exponent [29, Problem 10.7(b)] and the list decoding inequality [29, Problem 10.30], [30, Lemma 3.8.2] which is valid for any given block length, then the same proof is also valid for $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$.

Step II: Let us begin with continuity of $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W)$ in $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given such that for any Q'_X which satisfies $||Q'_X - Q_X|| \leq \epsilon/2$ also $\mathrm{supp}(Q_X) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(Q'_X)$. By definition, for any given $\delta_1 \in [0, \mathsf{R}]$ there exist a sequence of channel codes $\mathcal{C}$ where $\mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^{(n)})$ such that $Q_X^{(n)} \to Q_X$, and $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_n|}{n} \geq \mathsf{R} - \delta_1$, as well as $\mathcal{E}_c^+(\mathcal{C}) \geq \overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R}, Q_X, W) - \delta_1$. Also, for sufficiently large n

$$||Q_X^{(n)} - Q'_X|| \leq ||Q_X^{(n)} - Q_X|| + ||Q_X - Q'_X|| \leq \epsilon. \quad \text{(B.66)}$$

Using Lemma 24 (for the alphabet $\mathrm{supp}(Q_X)$), one can find $\delta > 0$ and a sequence of vectors $\mathbf{z}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{k_n - n}$ such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_n(Q_X^{(n)})$, the concatenation $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{(n)}) \in \mathcal{T}_{k_n}(Q'^{(n)}_X)$ where $Q'^{(n)}_X \to Q'_X$ as $n \to \infty$, and $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{l_n}{n} \leq \delta$. Let us now construct a sequence of channel codes $\mathcal{C}'$ where $\mathcal{C}'_{k_n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{k_n}(Q'^{(n)}_X)$, of length $k_n = l_n + n$ such that $Q'^{(n)}_X \to Q'_X$, by concatenating $\mathbf{z}^{(n)}$ to the codewords $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_n$. Now, the rate of the sequence of the new codes $\mathcal{C}'$ is

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}|}{k_n} = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{k_n} \cdot \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_{k_n}|}{n} \quad \text{(B.67)}$$

$$\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{(1+2\delta)n} \cdot \frac{\log|\mathcal{C}_{k_n}|}{n} \quad \text{(B.68)}$$

$$\geq \frac{\mathsf{R} - \delta_1}{1 + 2\delta} \quad \text{(B.69)}$$

and since the error probability of $\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}$ is at least as small as the error probability of $\mathcal{C}_n$ then the error exponent is

$$\mathcal{E}_c^+(\mathcal{C}') = \limsup_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{k_n} \log p_e(\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}) \quad \text{(B.70)}$$

[16]The continuity of $C_0(Q_X, W)$ in Q_X can be rigorously proved using the same techniques used in the rest of the proof.

$$= \limsup_{n\to\infty} -\frac{n}{k_n}\cdot\frac{1}{n}\log p_e(\mathcal{C}_n) \tag{B.71}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{(1+2\delta)}\limsup_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log p_e(\mathcal{C}_n) \tag{B.72}$$

$$= \frac{\mathcal{E}_c^+(\mathcal{C})}{(1+2\delta)} \tag{B.73}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{(1+2\delta)}\left[\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q_X,W)-\delta_1\right]. \tag{B.74}$$

As $\delta_1 > 0$ may be chosen arbitrary small then by definition

$$\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q'_X,W) \geq \frac{1}{(1+2\delta)}\overline{E}_e^*\left(\frac{\mathsf{R}}{1+2\delta},Q_X,W\right). \tag{B.75}$$

Since one can exchange the roles of Q_X and Q'_X in the above construction then also

$$\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q_X,W) \geq \frac{1}{(1+2\delta)}\overline{E}_e^*\left(\frac{\mathsf{R}}{1+2\delta},Q'_X,W\right). \tag{B.76}$$

and the continuity of $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q_X,W)$ immediately follows from the continuity of $\overline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q_X,W)$ in

$$\mathsf{R}\in(C_0(Q_X,W),I(Q_X\times W)), \tag{B.77}$$

and the fact that, from Lemma 24, $\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\delta = 0$.

To prove the same property for $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q_X,W)$, notice that the same construction can be used to modify a sequence of codes $\mathcal{C}$ which achieve $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q_X,W)$, into a new sequence of codes $\mathcal{C}'$, by concatenating a fixed vector $\mathbf{z}^{(n)}\in\mathcal{X}^{k_n-n}$ with type that tends to Q'_X to the codewords of $\mathcal{C}_n$, and obtain error probability close to that of $\mathcal{C}_n$. However, the resulting codes only exist for lengths k_n, while in order to achieve $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q'_X,W)$, a code should be constructed for any block length (due to the limit infimum in its definition). Nonetheless, since

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{k_{n+1}-k_n}{k_n} \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{k_{n+1}-n}{n} \leq \delta \tag{B.78}$$

one can invoke Lemma 25 and construct from $\mathcal{C}'_{k_n}$ a new sequence of codes $\mathcal{C}''_m$ for any block length m which achieve $\underline{E}_e^*(\mathsf{R},Q'_X,W)-\eta$ where $\lim_{\delta\to 0}\eta = 0$. The property is obtained by taking $\epsilon\downarrow 0$ which results $\delta\downarrow 0$. ■

APPENDIX C

In this appendix, we define the ensemble of type-dependent, variable-rate random binning SW codes, and analyze its exact error exponent. While in essence the proof techniques used for fixed-rate coding in [4] can be generalized, we provide a somewhat simpler proof, which also shows that the resulting expression is tight, and not just a lower bound on the actual random binning exponent (a result analogous to [33] for the random channel coding error exponent). The proof is based on the following lemma. The lemma is of importance as it verifies the asymptotic tightness of the union bound, even for the union of *exponentially* many events.

Lemma 28 (Tightness of the union bound)**.** *Let $\mathcal{A}_1,\mathcal{A}_2\ldots,\mathcal{A}_K$ be pairwise independent events from a probability*

space. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcup_{k=1}^{K}\mathcal{A}_k\right\} \geq \frac{1}{2}\cdot\min\left\{1,\sum_{k=1}^{K}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_k\right)\right\} \tag{C.1}$$

Proof: See [45, Lemma A.2, pp. 109]. ■

A random ensemble of SW codes is defined by a random sequence of encoders-decoders (S_n,Σ_n) with probability $\mathbb{P}(S_n=s_n,\Sigma_n=\sigma_n)$, and the average error probability over the random ensemble of codes is defined as $\overline{p}_{e,n}=\mathbb{E}\left[p_e(\mathcal{S}_n)\right]$. The *random-binning error exponent* is defined as

$$\bar{E}_e \triangleq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\overline{p}_{e,n}. \tag{C.2}$$

We analyze the ensemble performance of type-dependent, variable-rate SW codes, which are defined as follows:

- *Codebook generation:* For a given rate function $\rho(Q_X)$, generate $e^{n\rho(Q_X)}$ bins for every $Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and map each bin into a different binary string of length $n\cdot\rho(Q_X)$ nats. Next, assign to each $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$ a bin by independent random selection with a uniform distribution over all the bins of type class $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})$. Then, assign an index to each type $Q_X\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$. The above data is revealed to both the encoder and the decoder off-line.
- *Encoding:* Upon observing $\mathbf{x}$, determine its type class $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})$. Send to the decoder its type index, concatenated with its bin index (for the current type class $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})$).
- *Decoding:* First, recover the type class $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}})$ of $\mathbf{x}$. Then, we consider two options:
  - Maximum likelihood (ML): Choose $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in s_n^{-1}(s_n(\mathbf{x}))$ that maximizes $P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y})$. Since all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in s_n^{-1}(s_n(\mathbf{x}))$ are in the same type class, they have the same probability $P_{\mathbf{X}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$, so this decoding rule is equivalent to maximizing $P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$.
  - Minimum conditional entropy (MCE): Choose $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in s_n^{-1}(s_n(\mathbf{x}))$ that minimizes $H(\hat{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y}}|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}})$. Since all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in s_n^{-1}(s_n(\mathbf{x}))$ have the same empirical entropy $H(\hat{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}})$, so this decoding rule is equivalent to well-known, maximum mutual information (MMI) decoder (see, e.g., [46, Section IV.B]). The MCE decoder is equivalent to a decoder that estimates the unknown PMF P_{XY} for any candidate source block (generalized likelihood ratio test).

It is well known that the ML decoder, which depends on the source statistics $P_{\mathbf{XY}}$, minimizes the error probability. By contrast, the MCE decoder does not use $P_{\mathbf{XY}}$ at all. In the next theorem, we evaluate the random binning error exponent of the ML decoder, and show that the MCE decoder also achieves the same exponent, and thus it is a *universal* decoder. This exponent was initially derived in [4] (for both decoders), but the proof here is simpler, and also shows that the lower bound on the ML error exponent is tight for all rates.

Theorem 29. *Let $\rho(\cdot)$ be a given rate function, and let the ensemble of SW codes be as defined in Section II-B. Then for both the ML decoder and the MCE decoder, the limit in* (C.2) *exists and equals*

$$\bar{E}_e = \min_{Q_{XY}}\left\{D(Q_{XY}||P_{XY})+\left[\rho(Q_X)-H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+\right\}. \tag{C.3}$$

Proof: Suppose that $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ was emitted from the source and its joint type is $Q_{XY}=\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{xy}}$. Let the marginals and conditional types be $Q_X=\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}}$, $Q_Y=\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}$, and $Q_{X|Y}=\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}}$.

For the ML decoder, let

$$\Lambda_o(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \left\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in\mathcal{X}^n : P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y}) \geq P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})\right\}. \tag{C.4}$$

The conditional error probability, averaged over the random choice of binning is

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Pi}_{e,o}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) &\triangleq \mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcup_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in\{\Lambda_o(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\cap\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)\}} S_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})=S_n(\mathbf{x})\right\} && \text{(C.5)}\\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{1, e^{-n\rho(Q_X)}\cdot|\Lambda_o(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\cap\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)|\right\} && \text{(C.6)}\\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{1, e^{-n\rho(Q_X)}\cdot\left|\mathcal{T}_n(Q_{X|Y})\right|\right\} && \text{(C.7)}\\
&\doteq \min\left\{1,\exp\left[-n\left(\rho(Q_X)-H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right)\right]\right\} && \text{(C.8)}\\
&= \exp\left[-n\left[\rho(Q_X)-H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+\right] && \text{(C.9)}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to Lemma 28, and the fact that the bin indices are drawn independently in a given type class, and the second inequality is because for any pair $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}},\mathbf{y})\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_{X|Y})$, we have that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)$ and that $P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y})=P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})$.

For the MCE decoder, let

$$\Lambda_u(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \left\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in\mathcal{X}^n : H\left(\hat{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y}}|Q_Y\right)\leq H\left(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y\right)\right\}. \tag{C.10}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Pi}_{e,u}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) &\triangleq \mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcup_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in\{\Lambda_u(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\cap\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)\}} S_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})=S_n(\mathbf{x})\right\} && \text{(C.11)}\\
&\leq \min\left\{1, e^{-n\rho(Q_X)}\cdot|\Lambda_u(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\cap\mathcal{T}_n(Q_X)|\right\} && \text{(C.12)}\\
&\leq \min\left\{1, e^{-n\rho(Q_X)}\cdot|\Lambda_u(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})|\right\} && \text{(C.13)}\\
&\dot{\leq} \min\left\{1,\exp\left[-n\left(\rho(Q_X)-H\left(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y\right)\right)\right]\right\} && \text{(C.14)}\\
&= \exp\left[-n\left[\rho(Q_X)-H\left(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y\right)\right]_+\right], && \text{(C.15)}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by the union bound, and the following equality is because the number of sequences in any conditional type that belongs to $\Lambda_u(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ is exponentially upper bounded by $e^{nH(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)}$ and the number of joint types is polynomial $|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})|\leq(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}$.

It can be seen that on the exponential scale, the lower bound on $\bar{\Pi}_{e,o}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ and the upper bound on $\bar{\Pi}_{e,u}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ are identical. Thus, when taking expectation w.r.t. the i.i.d. source P_{XY}, the resulting asymptotic bounds on the error probability are identical (lower bound for the ML decoder, and upper bound for the MCE decoder). Moreover,

since the ML decoder minimizes the error probability, taking expectation w.r.t. P_{XY} we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\exp\left[-n\left[\rho(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{X}})-H(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}})\right]_+\right]\right\}\dot{\leq}\mathbb{E}\left\{\bar{\Pi}_{e,o}(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y})\right\} \tag{C.16}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}\left\{\bar{\Pi}_{e,u}(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y})\right\} \tag{C.17}$$

$$\dot{\leq}\mathbb{E}\left\{\exp\left[-n\left[\rho(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{X}})-H(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}})\right]_+\right]\right\} \tag{C.18}$$

so the asymptotic average error probability of both the ML decoder and the MCE decoder is

$$\overline{p}_{e,n}\doteq\mathbb{E}\left\{\exp\left[-n\left[\rho(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{X}})-H(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}|\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}})\right]_+\right]\right\} \tag{C.19}$$

$$=\sum_{Q_{XY}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})}\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{XY}}=Q_{XY}\right)\cdot\exp\left[-n\left[\rho(Q_X)-H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+\right] \tag{C.20}$$

$$\doteq\sum_{Q_{XY}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})}\exp\left[-n\cdot D(Q_{XY}||P_{XY})-n\left[\rho(Q_X)-H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+\right] \tag{C.21}$$

$$\doteq\exp\left[-n\cdot\min_{Q_{XY}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})}\left\{D(Q_{XY}||P_{XY})+\left[\rho(Q_X)-H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+\right\}\right] \tag{C.22}$$

where the last inequality is again because $|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})|\leq(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}$. Since the optimal value of the minimization problem inside the exponent is clearly finite, and the minimization argument is a continuous function, then

$$\overline{p}_{e,n}\doteq\exp\left[-n\cdot\min_{Q_{XY}}\left\{D(Q_{XY}||P_{XY})+\left[\rho(Q_X)-H(Q_{X|Y}|Q_Y)\right]_+\right\}\right]. \tag{C.23}$$

■

APPENDIX D

Consider the case of very weakly correlated sources[17], namely

$$P_{Y|X}(y|x)=P_Y(y)\cdot(1+\epsilon_{xy}) \tag{D.1}$$

where for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$ we have $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\epsilon_{xy}=0$ and $|\epsilon_{xy}|\ll 1$ for all $(x,y)\in(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})$. Consider again the minimization problem in (51)

$$\min_{Q_{Y|X}:D(Q_X\times Q_{Y|X}||P_{XY})\leq\mathsf{E}_e}\left\{I(Q_X\times Q_{Y|X})+D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X)\right\} \tag{D.2}$$

which from Lemma 32 is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tilde{Q}_Y}\min_{Q_{Y|X}:D(Q_X\times Q_{Y|X}||P_{XY})\leq\mathsf{E}_e}\left\{D(Q_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y|Q_X)+D\left(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X\right)\right\}. \tag{D.3}$$

Now, notice that if X and Y are independent, then the optimal solution is $\tilde{Q}_Y^*=Q_{Y|X}=P_Y$ for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$ and both divergences vanish. A continuity argument then implies that for the low dependence case, the two divergences at the optimal solution are close to 0. Therefore, we can use the following Euclidean approximation [41, Theorem

[17]In channel coding, this is referred to as *"very noisy channel"* [30, Section 3.4].

4.1]: For two PMFs P_X, Q_X such that $\mathrm{supp}(P_x) = \mathcal{X}$ and $Q_X \approx P_X$ we have that

$$D(Q_X||P_X) \approx \frac{1}{2}\chi^2(Q_X, P_X) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \frac{(Q_X(x) - P_X(x))^2}{P_X(x)}. \tag{D.4}$$

Moreover, for another PMF $\tilde{P}_X$, if $\tilde{P}_X \approx P_X$ then

$$D(Q_X||P_X) \approx \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \frac{(Q_X(x) - P_X(x))^2}{\tilde{P}_X(x)} \tag{D.5}$$

which also shows that $D(P_X||Q_X) \approx D(Q_X||P_X)$. Now, the objective function of the minimization problem can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&D(Q_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y|Q_X) + D(Q_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \\
&\approx \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{Q_X}\left\{\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \frac{(Q_{Y|X}(y|X) - \tilde{Q}_Y(y))^2}{\tilde{Q}_Y(y)} + \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \frac{\left(Q_{Y|X}(y|X) - P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right)^2}{P_{Y|X}(y|X)}\right\} &\text{(D.6)}\\
&\approx \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{Q_X}\left\{\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \frac{(Q_{Y|X}(y|X) - \tilde{Q}_Y(y))^2 + \left(Q_{Y|X}(y|X) - P_{Y|X}(y|X)\right)^2}{P_Y(y)}\right\} &\text{(D.7)}
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly the constraint $Q_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{rb}}$ is approximated by

$$\frac{1}{2}\cdot\mathbb{E}_{Q_X}\left\{\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \frac{\left(Q_{Y|X}(y|X) - P_{Y|X}(y|X)\right)^2}{P_Y(y)}\right\} \le \mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X). \tag{D.8}$$

The Lagrangian for a given $\tilde{Q}_Y$ (ignoring positivity constraints for the moment) is

$$\begin{aligned}
L\left(Q_{Y|X}, \lambda, \mu_x\right) \quad = \tfrac{1}{2}\cdot \quad &\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \frac{(Q_{Y|X} - \tilde{Q}_Y(y))^2 + (1+\lambda)\left(Q_{Y|X}(y|x) - P_{Y|X}(y|x)\right)^2}{P_Y(y)} \\
&+ \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \mu_x \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_{Y|X}(y|x)
\end{aligned} \tag{D.9}$$

with $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu_x \in \mathbb{R}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Differentiating w.r.t. some $Q_{Y|X}(y'|x')$ for $x' \in X, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ we have

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial Q_{Y|X}(y'|x')} = \frac{1}{2}\cdot Q_X(x')\cdot \frac{2\left(Q_{Y|X}(y'|x') - \tilde{Q}_Y(y')\right) + 2(1+\lambda)\left(Q_{Y|X}(y'|x') - P_{Y|X}(y'|x')\right)}{P_Y(y')} + \mu_{x'} \tag{D.10}$$

and equating the derivative to zero in this case is equivalent to

$$\frac{Q_{Y|X}(y'|x') - \tilde{Q}_Y(y') + (1+\lambda)\left[Q_{Y|X}(y'|x') - P_{Y|X}(y'|x')\right]}{P_Y(y')} + \mu'_{x'} = 0. \tag{D.11}$$

Thus, for some $\lambda > 0$

$$Q^*_{Y|X}(y|x) = \frac{1+\lambda}{2+\lambda}P_{Y|X}(y|x) + \frac{1}{2+\lambda}\tilde{Q}_Y(y) - \frac{\mu'_x}{2+\lambda}P_Y(y). \tag{D.12}$$

It can be easily seen that $\mu'_x = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ so

$$Q^*_{Y|X} = \alpha P_{Y|X} + (1-\alpha)\tilde{Q}_Y \tag{D.13}$$

for some $\alpha = \frac{1+\lambda}{2+\lambda}$, where α is either chosen to satisfy the constraint or $\alpha = 1/2$. It is evident that indeed the solution satisfies the positivity constraints. Now, for any given α the resulting value of the optimization problem is

$$\left[\frac{\alpha^2 + (\alpha-1)^2}{2}\right] \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \frac{\left[P_{Y|X}(y|x) - \tilde{Q}_Y(y)\right]^2}{P_Y(y)} \tag{D.14}$$

and by differentiating w.r.t. some $\tilde{Q}_Y(y')$ for $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ we have

$$\left[\frac{\alpha^2 + (\alpha-1)^2}{2}\right] \cdot \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \frac{Q_X(x)}{P_Y(y')} \left[-2\left(P_{Y|X}(y'|x) - \tilde{Q}_Y(y')\right)\right] \tag{D.15}$$

and equating to zero we obtain that the optimal solution is

$$\tilde{Q}^*_Y(y) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) P_{Y|X}(y|x). \tag{D.16}$$

Notice that the optimal solution $\tilde{Q}^*_Y$ does not depend on α. Thus, for a given $\mathsf{E}_e \geq D(Q_X||P_X)$ the optimal value of α is given by $\alpha^* \approx \max(\tilde{\alpha}, 1/2)$ where $\tilde{\alpha}$ achieves equality in (D.8),

$$\tilde{\alpha} = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)}{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \frac{\left(P_{Y|X}(y|x) - \tilde{Q}^*_Y(y)\right)^2}{P_Y(y)}}} \approx 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)}{D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}^*_Y|Q_X)}} \tag{D.17}$$

using again (D.5). Then, in the case of very weakly correlated sources, the optimal rate function can be approximated by

$$\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \approx \mathsf{E}_e + H(Q_X) - D(Q_X||P_X) - \left[\alpha^{*2} + (\alpha^* - 1)^2\right] D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}^*_Y|Q_X) \tag{D.18}$$

where α^* is given analytically as a function of E_e. In addition, similar approximations for the unconstrained minimization problem (42) show that

$$D(Q'_{Y|X}||P_{Y|X}|Q_X) \approx \frac{1}{4} D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}^*_Y|Q_X). \tag{D.19}$$

Thus, for $D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X||P_X) + \frac{1}{4}D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}^*_Y|Q_X)$ we have $\tilde{\alpha} \leq 1/2$ and by substituting $\tilde{\alpha}$ in (D.18) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e) \;\approx\; & H(Q_X) - \mathsf{E}_e + D(Q_X||P_X) \\ & - D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}^*_Y|Q_X) + 2\sqrt{D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}^*_Y|Q_X)\left(\mathsf{E}_e - D(Q_X||P_X)\right)}. \end{aligned} \tag{D.20}$$

For $\rho_{\text{sp}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ the analysis is similar, and in this case $\alpha^* \in (0,1)$, so we obtain the exact same expression as in (D.20), but this time it is valid for the entire range $D(Q_X||P_X) \leq \mathsf{E}_e \leq D(Q_X \times (Q_X \times P_{Y|X})_Y||P_{XY})$.

Notice that $D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y^*|Q_X)$ is the mutual information of the joint distribution $Q_X \times P_{Y|X}$ and thus is a measure of the independence between X and Y. As $D(P_{Y|X}||\tilde{Q}_Y^*|Q_X) \to 0$ then X and Y become "more" independent, and then the rate function $\rho_{\text{rb}}(Q_X, \mathsf{E}_e)$ is affine for almost the entire range $\mathsf{E}_e \geq D(Q_X||P_X)$. Indeed, in this case, the main error event is associated with "bad binning", i.e. at least two source blocks of the same type are mapped to the same bin by the random binning procedure.

APPENDIX E

In this appendix, we provide several useful lemmas.

Lemma 30. *Let P, Q be two PMFs over some alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\text{supp}(P) = \text{supp}(Q) = \mathcal{X}$, $P \neq Q$, and*

$$Q_\alpha \triangleq (1-\alpha)P + \alpha Q. \tag{E.1}$$

Also, let $\alpha_{max} = \max\{\alpha : Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})\}$. Then, $D(Q_\alpha||P)$ is a strictly increasing function of α for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{max})$.

Proof: Let $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{max}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\alpha_1} &= (1-\alpha_1)P + \alpha_1 Q && \text{(E.2)}\\
&= \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}\left(\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} - \alpha_2 + 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1}\right)P + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}\alpha_2 Q && \text{(E.3)}\\
&= \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}\left(1 - \alpha_2 + \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{\alpha_1}\right)P + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}\alpha_2 Q && \text{(E.4)}\\
&= \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}\left[(1-\alpha_2)P + \alpha_2 Q\right] + \frac{(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)}{\alpha_2}P && \text{(E.5)}\\
&= \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}Q_{\alpha_2} + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}\right)P && \text{(E.6)}
\end{aligned}$$

thus Q_{α_1} is a convex combination of Q_{α_2} and P with coefficient $\gamma \triangleq \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}$, and $0 < \gamma < 1$. Now, since divergence is strictly convex function then

$$\begin{aligned}
D(Q_{\alpha_1}||P) &= D(\gamma Q_{\alpha_2} + (1-\gamma)P||P) && \text{(E.7)}\\
&< \gamma D(Q_{\alpha_2}||P) + (1-\gamma)D(P||P) && \text{(E.8)}\\
&= \gamma D(Q_{\alpha_2}||P) && \text{(E.9)}\\
&< D(Q_{\alpha_2}||P) && \text{(E.10)}
\end{aligned}$$

and thus $D(Q_\alpha||P)$ is strictly increasing in α. ■

Lemma 31. *Let $f_i(z) : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be convex functions for $i = 1, 2$. Consider the optimization problem*

$$W(E) = \min_{f_1(z) \leq E} f_2(z). \tag{E.11}$$

assuming that the constraint is feasible for some interval $E \in \mathcal{J}$. Then $W(E)$ is a convex function of E in $\mathcal{J}$ and

$E - W(E)$ *is a concave function* E in $\mathcal{J}$.

Proof: This is a standard result. For example, in [47, Theorem 3], this theorem is proved for the case that f_1 and f_2 are information divergences. The proof may be used verbatim for any convex functions. ■

Lemma 32. *Let* $P_X \times P_{Y|X}$ *be a given joint distribution over* $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$*. Then the distribution* Q_Y *that minimizes* $D(P_X \times P_{Y|X}||P_X \times Q_Y)$ *is the marginal distribution* Q_Y^* *corresponding to* $P_{Y|X}$ *namely,* $Q_Y^*(y) = \sum_x P_X(x)P_{Y|X}(y|x)$.

Proof: See [37, Lemma 10.8.1]. ■

Corollary 33. *Let* $P_X \times P_{Y|X}$ *be a given joint distribution over* $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$*. Then the vector* $Q_Y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$ *that minimizes* $D(P_X \times P_{Y|X}||P_X \times Q_Y)$[18] *under the constraint* $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_Y(y) \leq 1$ *and* $Q_Y(y) \geq 0$ *for all* $y \in \mathcal{Y}$*, is* $Q_Y^*(y) = \sum_x P_X(x)P_{Y|X}(y|x)$.

Proof: Suppose that the minimizer vector Q_Y^* satisfies $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_Y^*(y) < 1$. Then for some $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$, we can increase $Q_Y^*(y')$ by $1 - \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_Y^*(y) > 0$ and obtain $\bar{Q}_Y$ which satisfies $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \overline{Q}_Y(y) = 1$. But,

$$D(P_X \times P_{Y|X}||P_X \times Q_Y^*) = \sum_{x,y} P_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{P_{XY}(x,y)}{P_X(x)Q_Y^*(y)} \tag{E.12}$$

$$= \sum_{x,y\neq y'} P_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{P_{XY}(x,y)}{P_X(x)Q_Y^*(y)} + \sum_x P_{XY}(x,y') \log \frac{P_{XY}(x,y')}{P_X(x)Q_Y^*(y')} \tag{E.13}$$

$$> \sum_{x,y\neq y'} P_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{P_{XY}(x,y)}{P_X(x)\overline{Q}_Y(y)} + \sum_x P_{XY}(x,y') \log \frac{P_{XY}(x,y')}{P_X(x)\overline{Q}_Y(y')} \tag{E.14}$$

and this contradicts the fact that Q_Y^* is a minimizer. Thus, we must have $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} Q_Y^*(y) = 1$. In this case, Lemma 32 shows that the optimal solution is $Q_Y^*(y) = \sum_x P_X(x)P_{Y|X}(y|x)$. ■

Lemma 34. *Let* $P_X \times P_{Y|X}$ *be a given joint distribution over* $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$*. Then the distribution* Q_Y *that minimizes* $D(P_X \times Q_Y||P_X \times P_{Y|X})$ *is the marginal distribution* Q_Y^* *corresponding to* $P_{Y|X}$ *namely,* $Q_Y^*(y) = \sum_x P_X(x)P_{Y|X}(y|x)$.

Proof: We have

$$D(P_X \times Q_Y||P_X \times P_{Y|X}) = D(Q_Y||P_{Y|X}|P_X) \tag{E.15}$$

$$= -\sum_y Q_Y(y) \sum_x P_X(x) \log \frac{P_{Y|X}(y|x)}{Q_Y(y)} \tag{E.16}$$

[18]Notice that the divergence is well defined even if $\{Q_Y\}$ do not sum exactly to 1.

$$\geq -\sum_y Q_Y(y)\log\frac{\sum_x P_X(x)P_{Y|X}(y|x)}{Q_Y(y)} \tag{E.17}$$

$$= -\sum_y Q_Y(y)\log\frac{Q_Y^*(y)}{Q_Y(y)} \tag{E.18}$$

$$= D(Q_Y||Q_Y^*) \tag{E.19}$$

$$\geq 0 \tag{E.20}$$

and equality is obtained for $Q_Y = Q_Y^*$. ■

This following lemma is stated and proved in [30, Section 3A.1, inequality (k)].

Lemma 35 (A variant of Minkowski's inequality)**.** *Let $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, let Q_X be a PMF over a finite alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\{a_x(i)\}$ be a set of non-negative numbers for $1 \leq i \leq I$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Then,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I}\left(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)a_x(i)^\lambda\right)^{1/\lambda} \leq \left(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q_X(x)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{I} a_x(i)\right)^\lambda\right)^{1/\lambda} \tag{E.21}$$

Lemma 36. *Let P_1, P_2 be two PMFs over some alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, such that $\mathrm{supp}(P_2) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(P_1)$. Define*

$$Q_\alpha(x) \triangleq \psi_\alpha P_1^\alpha(x)P_2^{1-\alpha}(x), \tag{E.22}$$

where $\alpha \in [0,1]$ and ψ_α is a normalization factor such that $Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$. Then, $D\left(Q_\alpha||P_1\right)$ is a continuous function of α whose limit, as $\alpha \to 0$, is $D(Q'||P)$ where

$$P_2'(x) = \begin{cases} \psi' \cdot P_2(x) & P_1(x) > 0 \\ 0 & P_1(x) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{E.23}$$

for some normalization factor ψ'. Moreover, $D\left(Q_\alpha||P_1\right)$ is monotonic, strictly decreasing function of α unless $P_2' = P_1$.

Proof: This is [29, Problem 2.14] but for completeness, we provide a proof here based on [47]. First, notice that $P_1(x) = 0 \Rightarrow Q_\alpha(x) = 0$ and thus all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $P_1(x) = 0$ are immaterial to the divergence, assuming the regular convention, that any summand of the form $0 \cdot \frac{0}{0}$ is 0. Thus it may be assumed w.l.o.g. that $\mathrm{supp}(P_1) = \mathcal{X}$ and $P_2' = P_2$.

Continuity: Since $\mathrm{supp}(P_1) = \mathcal{X}$ then $D\left(Q_\alpha||P_1\right)$ is a continuous function of Q_α in $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$. As Q_α is a continuous function of α we get that $D\left(Q_\alpha||P_1\right)$ is a continuous function of α.

Limit for $\alpha \to 0$: Since $\mathrm{supp}(P_1) = \mathcal{X}$ we get that $\mathrm{supp}(Q_\alpha) = \mathrm{supp}(P_2)$. It is easily seen that as $\alpha \to 0$ we have $Q_\alpha(x) \to P_2(x)$.

Monotonicity: Consider the following optimization problem

$$W(E) = \min_{D(Q||P_2)\leq E} D(Q||P_1). \tag{E.24}$$

Standard Lagrange techniques, as used in this paper, show that the optimal solution is

$$Q(x) = \psi P_1^{\frac{1}{1+\lambda}}(x) P_2^{\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}}(x) \tag{E.25}$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is either chosen such that the constraint is satisfied with equality, or $\lambda = 0$. When $\lambda > 0$ defining $\alpha \triangleq \frac{1}{1+\lambda}$ we get $W(E) = D(Q_\alpha || P_1)$. Thus, if we show that $W(E)$ is a monotonic increasing function of λ, then the proof is finished because α is an increasing function of λ. To this end, notice that:

1) $W(E)$ is a strictly decreasing function of E.
2) Using Lemma 31, $W(E)$ is a strictly convex function of E which implies that $\frac{dW(E)}{dE}$ is a strictly increasing function of E.
3) We have that

$$\frac{dW(E)}{dE} = -\lambda. \tag{E.26}$$

To see this relation, suppose that λ is chosen to satisfy the constraint E. Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned} W(E) &= D\left(Q_\alpha || P_1\right) && \text{(E.27)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_\alpha(x) \cdot \log \frac{Q_\alpha(x)}{P_1(x)} && \text{(E.28)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_\alpha(x) \cdot \log \frac{P_2^\lambda(x)}{Q_\alpha^\lambda(x)} + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_\alpha(x) \cdot \log \frac{Q_\alpha^{1+\lambda}(x)}{P_1(x) \cdot P_2^\lambda(x)} && \text{(E.29)} \\ &= -\lambda E - (\lambda + 1) \log(\psi) && \text{(E.30)} \\ &= -\lambda E - (\lambda + 1) \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_1^{\frac{1}{1+\lambda}}(x) P_2^{\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}}(x) \right). && \text{(E.31)} \end{aligned}$$

When differentiating we obtain

$$\frac{dW(E)}{dE} = -\lambda - E\frac{d\lambda}{dE} - \frac{d\lambda}{dE} \cdot \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left[(\lambda + 1) \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_1^{\frac{1}{1+\lambda}}(x) P_2^{\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}}(x) \right) \right], \tag{E.32}$$

and because $\frac{d}{d\lambda} \left[(\lambda + 1) \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_1^{\frac{1}{1+\lambda}}(x) P_2^{\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}}(x) \right) \right] = -E$ we obtain the desired result.

These properties imply that as E increases $W(E)$ decreases and $\frac{dW(E)}{dE} = -\lambda$ increases. This results that $W(E)$ is a monotonic increasing function of λ, and concludes the proof.

Strict monotonicity can be verified by noticing that all monotonicity relations are strict.

■

REFERENCES

[1] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf, "Noiseless coding of correlated information sources," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 471–480, July 1973.

[2] R. G. Gallager, "Source coding with side information and universal coding," M.I.T., LIDS- P-937, 1976, available online: http://web.mit.edu/gallager/www/papers/paper5.pdf.

[3] ——, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*. Wiley, 1968.

[4] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, "Towards a general theory of source networks," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 155–165, March 1980.

[5] I. Csiszár, J. Körner, and K. Marton, "A new look at the error exponent of discrete memoryless channels," in *Proc. of International Symposium on Information Theory*, 1977, p. 107 (abstract).

[6] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, "Graph decomposition: A new key to coding theorems," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 5–12, January 1981.

[7] R. Ahlswede and G. Dueck, "Good codes can be produced by a few permutations," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 430–443, May 1982.

[8] I. Csiszár, "Linear codes for sources and source networks: Error exponents, universal coding," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 585–592, July 1982.

[9] Y. Oohama and T. S. Han, "Universal coding for the Slepian-Wolf data compression system and the strong converse theorem," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1908–1919, November 1994.

[10] J. Chen, H. D.-k., A. Jagmohan, L. Lastras-Montaño, and E.-h. Yang, "On the linear codebook-level duality between Slepian-Wolf coding and channel coding," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 5575–5590, December 2009.

[11] J. Chen, D.-k. He, and A. Jagmohan, "On the duality between Slepian-Wolf coding and channel coding under mismatched decoding," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 4006–4018, September 2009.

[12] D.-k. He, L. Lastras-Montaño, E.-h. Yang, A. Jagmohan, and J. Chen, "On the redundancy of Slepian-Wolf coding," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 5607–5627, December 2009.

[13] S. Kuzuoka, "On the redundancy of variable-rate Slepian-Wolf coding," in *Information Theory and its Applications (ISITA), 2012 International Symposium on*, October 2012, pp. 155–159.

[14] S. Sarvotham, D. Baron, and R. G. Baraniuk, "Variable-rate universal Slepian-Wolf coding with feedback," in *Signals, Systems and Computers, 2005. Conference Record of the Thirty-Ninth Asilomar Conference on*, October 2005, pp. 8–12.

[15] B. G. Kelly and A. B. Wagner, "Improved source coding exponents via witsenhausen's rate," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 5615–5633, September 2011.

[16] S. Kuzuoka and S. Watanabe, "An information-spectrum approach to weak variable-length Slepian-Wolf coding," in *Information Theory (ISIT), 2014 IEEE International Symposium on*, June 2014, pp. 2684–2688.

[17] N. Merhav, "Erasure/list exponents for Slepian-Wolf decoding," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4463–4471, August 2014, available online: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1305.5626.pdf.

[18] J. Chen, D. He, A. Jagmohan, and L. A. Lastras-Montaño, "On the reliability function of variable-rate Slepian-Wolf coding," available online: http://www.ece.mcmaster.ca/~junchen/IT_variableSW.pdf.

[19] ——, "On the reliability function of variable-rate Slepian-Wolf coding," in *Proc. of 45th Annual Allerton Conference Communication, Control, and Computing*, September 2007.

[20] J. Chen, D.-k. He, A. Jagmohan, and L. A. Lastras-Montaño, "On universal variable-rate Slepian-Wolf coding," in *Proc. of IEEE International Conference on Communications*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1426–1430.

[21] P. A. Humblet, "Generalization of huffman coding to minimize the probability of buffer overflow," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 27, pp. 230–232, March 1981.

[22] F. Jelinek, "Buffer overflow in variable length coding of fixed rate sources," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 490–501, May 1968.

[23] I. Csiszár, "On the error exponent of source-channel transmission with a distortion threshold," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 823–827, November 1982.

[24] K. Marton, "Error exponent for source coding with a fidelity criterion," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 197–199, March 1974.

[25] B. Nakiboglu and L. Zheng, "Errors-and-erasures decoding for block codes with feedback," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 24–49, January 2012.

[26] I. E. Telatar, "Exponential bounds for list size moments and error probability," in *Proceedings 1998 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW*, June 1998, p. 60.

[27] N. Merhav, "On optimum parameter modulation-estimation from a large deviations perspective," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 7215–7225, December 2012.

[28] ——, "On optimum strategies for minimizing exponential moments of a given cost function," *Communications in Information and Systems*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 343–368, 2011.

[29] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[30] A. J. Viterbi and J. K. Omura, *Principles of Digital Communication and Coding*. Dover Publications, 2009.

[31] F. Jelinek, "Evaluation of expurgated bound exponents," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 501–505, May 1968.

[32] N. Merhav, "On zero-rate error exponents of finite-state channels with input-dependent states," *Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, June 2014, available online: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1406.7092.pdf.

[33] R. G. Gallager, "The random coding bound is tight for the average code (corresp.)," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 244–246, March 1973.

[34] S. Arimoto, "Computation of random coding exponent functions," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 665–671, November 1976.

[35] J. R. Lesh, "Computational algorithms for coding bound exponents." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976.

[36] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.

[37] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory (Wiley Series in Telecommunications and Signal Processing)*. Wiley-Interscience, 2006.

[38] F. Rezaei and C. D. Charalambous, "Robust coding for uncertain sources: a minimax approach," in *Information Theory (ISIT), 2005 IEEE International Symposium on*, September 2005, pp. 1539–1543.

[39] R. Ahlswede, "Coloring hypergraphs: A new approach to multi-user source coding, part II," *Journal of Combinatorics*, vol. 5, pp. 220–268, 1980.

[40] M. Sion, "On general minimax theorems," *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 171–176, 1958.

[41] I. Csiszár and P. C. Shields, *Information Theory and Statistics: A Tutorial*, ser. Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory. Now Publishers Inc, 2004.

[42] I. Csiszár and G. Tusnády, "Information Geometry and Alternating Minimization Procedures," *Statistics and Decisions*, vol. Supplement Issue 1, 1984.

[43] E. A. Haroutunian, "On the optimality of information transmission by a channel with finite number of states known at the input," *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk Armenii, Matematika*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 81–90, 1969.

[44] E. A. Haroutunian, M. E. Haroutunian, and A. N. Harutyunyan, "Reliability criteria in information theory and in statistical hypothesis testing," vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 97–263, January 2007.

[45] N. Shulman, "Communication over an unknown channel via common broadcasting," Ph.D. dissertation, Tel Aviv University, Department of Electrical Engineering - Systems, July 2003, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.407.7542&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

[46] A. Lapidoth and P. Narayan, "Reliable communication under channel uncertainty," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 2148–2177, October 1998.

[47] R. E. Blahut, "Hypothesis testing and information theory," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 405–417, July 1974.